

THE EXPOSITOR

VOL. III.

## List of Contributors to Volume III.

- REV. PROFESSOR B. W. BACON, D.D., LL.D.  
REV. THOMAS BARNS, M.A.  
REV. PROFESSOR W. H. BENNETT, D.D., LITT.D.  
VERY REV. J. H. BERNARD, D.D., D.C.L.  
REV. ARTHUR CARR, M.A.  
REV. PROFESSOR A. E. GARVIE, M.A., D.D.  
REV. PROFESSOR A. R. GORDON, M.A.  
PROFESSOR J. RENDEL HARRIS, M.A., LITT.D.  
J. H. A. HART, M.A.  
REV. PRINCIPAL JAMES IVERACH, D.D.  
REV. C. H. W. JOHNS, M.A.  
E. E. KELLETT, M.A.  
REV. ASAD MANSUR, OF NAZARETH.  
PROFESSOR G. CURRIE MARTIN, M.A., B.D.  
REV. J. B. MAYOR, LITT.D.  
REV. JAMES MOFFATT, D.D.  
REV. W. O. E. OESTERLEY, B.D.  
REV. L. B. RADFORD, M.A.  
PROFESSOR SIR W. M. RAMSAY, D.C.L., LL.D., D.D.  
REV. H. A. REDPATH, M.A., LITT.D.  
REV. PROFESSOR W. SANDAY, D.D., LITT.D.  
REV. PROFESSOR C. ANDERSON SCOTT, M.A.  
PROFESSOR ALEX. SOUTER, M.A., LITT.D.  
REV. PROFESSOR JAMES STALKER, D.D.  
REV. W. L. WALKER.  
REV. A. WESTCOTT, M.A.

# THE EXPOSITOR

EDITED BY THE REV.

W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A., LL.D.

*SEVENTH SERIES*



Volume III

HODDER AND STOUGHTON  
WARWICK SQUARE, LONDON, E.C

---

MCMVII

ser. 7

v. 3

1907:1

BUTLER & TANNER,  
THE SELWOOD PRINTING WORKS,  
FROME, AND LONDON.



## *CHRIST, THE FULFILMENT OF PROPHECY.*

IF we accept the statements in the New Testament, which are professedly historical, as historically true in their broad outlines, we cannot help observing that over and over again : (a) the writers of the books ; (b) the speakers in the narratives ; and above all else (c) our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, claim that He was the fulfilment of prophecy. Whether they had a right to do this or not is another thing ; if our Lord had not, then He was an impostor, or else He made a great mistake, and the belief of the Christian world in Him as a Being such as it has always believed Him to be must pass away, in that He made claims which He had no right to make. If He was right, then His claim upon us is all the stronger, because we can see that Divine Providence all through the ages of God's dealing with the human race had been preparing the way for His coming and His work.

Before going any farther it is necessary to define our terms.

Fulfilment does not necessarily mean the only fulfilment which a prophecy is capable of. In the prophecies attributed to our Lord, we can see more than one application for some of the words. Some refer to what He saw was impending—e.g., the destruction of Jerusalem ; some refer to His second coming ; some refer to both. We can see this now, or, at any rate, most of us think we can. So it was with the prophecies of which we see our Lord was the fulfilment. No doubt, most of them, if not all, but perhaps

all, had a more immediate application : this was very often patent both to the prophet and to his hearers. But beyond that it could be seen that the language was capable of some greater and grander interpretation. Neither the prophet himself nor his hearers knew when this other fulfilment was to come, though the New Testament tells us that they "sought and searched diligently . . . searching what time or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did point unto" (1 Pet. i. 10-11). None the less, there it was awaiting its time, and we who look back, if we are teachable, can see how that time came. Neither must we tie up all prophecy, as if, even now, it had received its perfect fulfilment. It may in some cases, if not in all, even though it has had a past fulfilment, be capable of still further fulfilment in God's good time.

For the word "fulfilment," then, we might substitute, as we mean rather *that*, the "realization" of prophecy. Thus, for instance, when in the first Gospel we have over and over again, as was natural in a Gospel written for Jewish readers, the expression "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken," we may very well paraphrase that for ourselves : "that there might be a realization of that which was spoken." This will help us a little in solving the difficulty which troubles some minds when St. Matthew or St. Paul adopts Rabbinic modes of explanation of the older Scriptures. The writer, without discussing the legitimacy of the mode of interpretation, is appealing to his hearers on their own grounds. Here, he says, you can see a realization of what your own teachers have practically taught you to expect.

The word Prophecy, too, has of late years been more distinctly used as a word of wider application than that which was popularly given to it in bygone times. It not only deals with the foretelling of future events, but also with the forth-telling or publication of God's will towards



and about men. And when we see, as God's providential system or plan of dealing with the world develops itself, higher and nobler moral codes and a deeper sense of sin coming to the birth, we see also that this was a leading up to, and a preliminary preparation for, the publication of that code of Gospel morality, which is also being constantly enlarged and developed in its application.

With regard to the claims made in various ways in the New Testament that Christ was the fulfilment of prophecy, but little need be said about some of them. That the writers of the books of the New Testament felt quite sure of it we can see at once: St. Matthew constantly appeals to the Old Testament as being fulfilled; St. Mark, who was not as likely to do so, begins his Gospel with an appeal to Isaiah, concerning the preparation of the way of the Lord; St. Luke, when he comes to speak of St. John the Baptist's ministry, does the same; the Fourth Gospel makes more than one notable appeal to the Old Testament in the account of the Crucifixion; the preaching of the Gospel to the Jews, as recorded in the Acts, is a constant declaration to them that their Scriptures have been fulfilled in the Person of Christ; St. Paul, to quote but one instance from his epistles, says that "Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, . . . and that He hath been raised on the third day according to the Scriptures"; the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, whoever he may have been, has as one of his greatest objects to show that Christ fulfilled the types that went before of Him in the rites and sacrifices of the Jewish Church. We have quoted St. Peter already: the Second Epistle attributed to him tells us that "we have the word of prophecy made more sure" (i. 19). It is not, therefore, the fanciful idea of one writer, but the conviction of many.

More than one speaker in the Gospel narratives assert

the same thing. Perhaps one of the most notable instances is to be found in St. John (i. 45). Philip says to Nathanael : " We have found Him, of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets, did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph." And in the Acts, whether it be St. Peter (ii. 25), or SS. Peter and John together (iii. 18), or the whole body of the faithful in their prayers (iv. 25), or St. Stephen (vii. 52), or St. Philip (viii. 35), or St. Paul (xiii. 23), or St. James (xv. 15), all alike hark back to the Old Testament as being fulfilled over and over again in the life of Christ.

And when we come to the words of our Lord Himself we find the same claim asserted by Him more often perhaps than most of us have ever noticed.

In the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v. 17) He says : " Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets : I came not to destroy, but to fulfil " ; and, in His development of the teaching of the old law in that Sermon, we have worked out for us just what we have indicated as being comprised above under the term " fulfilment of prophecy." He claims for St. John Baptist that he was the fulfilment of prophecy as being His forerunner (Matt. xi. 10 || Luke vii. 27).<sup>1</sup> He pointed to Himself as being destined to fulfil the type of Jonah (Matt. xii. 40). He declared that His reception by His hearers was a realization or fulfilment of a prophecy which He ascribed to Isaiah (Matt. xiii. 14 || Mark vii. 6 ; cp. xv. 7). Of Isaiah lxi., when He opened His ministry in the synagogue at Nazareth, He declared, " To-day hath this Scripture been fulfilled in your ears " (Luke iv. 21).

But it was when our Lord's life was drawing to a close that He called attention more especially to the fulfilment of the older Scriptures. On the way to Jerusalem at the

<sup>1</sup> He certainly intended His hearers to believe that St. John the Baptist was the Elijah of Malachi's prophecy (Matt. xi. 14 ; cp. xvii. 11-13, Mark ix. 13),



end of the long journey through Peraea of which we hear most in St. Luke, we are told that He took unto Him the twelve and said unto them, "Behold, we go up to Jerusalem, and all the things that are written by the prophets shall be accomplished unto the Son of Man. For He shall be delivered up unto the Gentiles, and shall be mocked, and shamefully entreated, and spit upon: and they shall scourge and kill Him: and the third day He shall rise again" (Luke xviii. 31-33). After the incident of the striking off by St. Peter of the servant's ear, and our Lord's reminder, "thinkest thou that I cannot beseech My Father, and He shall even now send Me more than twelve legions of angels?" He goes on: "How then should the Scriptures be fulfilled that thus it must be?" (Matt. xxvi. 54); and a little later, "I sat daily in the temple teaching, and ye took Me not. But all this is come to pass, that the Scriptures of the prophets might be fulfilled" (xxvi. 56 || Mark xiv. 49). So at the last supper, "The Son of Man goeth even as it is written of Him" (Matt. xxvi. 24 || Mark xiv. 21; cp. Luke xxii. 22).

Again, after His Resurrection the same truth is asseverated with great persistence. "O foolish men, and slow of heart to believe in all that the prophets have spoken! Behoved it not the Christ to suffer these things, and to enter into His glory? And beginning from Moses and from all the prophets, He interpreted to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself" (Luke xxiv. 25-27), whilst the effect upon the two who heard these words is described: "Was not our heart burning within us, while He spake to us in the way, while He opened to us the Scriptures?" And later on, apparently the very same evening, "He said unto them (i.e., to the eleven and others), These are My words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, how that all things must needs be fulfilled, which are written

in the law of Moses, and the prophets, and the psalms, concerning Me. Then opened He their mind, that they might understand the Scriptures ; and He said unto them, Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer, and rise again from the dead the third day ; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name unto all the nations, beginning from Jerusalem ” (Luke xxiv. 45-47).

We have at present limited our notice to the Synoptic Gospels : the Fourth Gospel tells the same story. After the first cleansing of the Temple and our Lord’s remarkable words, “ Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up ” (John ii. 19), which, according to the Synoptics, were quoted against Him in a perverted form at His trial, St. John goes on, after explaining “ He spake of the temple of His body,” “ When therefore He was raised from the dead, His disciples remembered that He spake this ; and they believed the Scripture (this *must* refer to the Old Testament), and the word which Jesus had said ” (John ii. 22). How strong is the assertion, “ Ye search the Scriptures, because ye think that in them ye have eternal life ; and these are they which bear witness of Me ” (John v. 39). Or again, immediately afterwards, “ Moses wrote of Me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe My words ? ” (John v. 46, 47). Again, with regard to the triumphal entry into Jerusalem, and its fulfilment of prophecy, it is written, “ These things understood not His disciples at the first : but when Jesus was glorified, then remembered they that these things were written of Him ” (John xii. 16). He Himself is said to have applied to the traitor the words from the Psalms (xli. 9), “ He that eateth My bread lifted up his heel against Me ” (John xiii. 18) and also, “ Not one of them perished, but the son of perdition ; that the Scripture might be fulfilled ” (John xvii. 12). The world’s hatred of Him is said to be the fulfilment of the words from



other Psalms (xxxv. 19 ; lxix. 4) : “ They hated Me without a cause ” (John xv. 25). Moreover, though it may perhaps be open to question at what period in our Lord’s life it was that He, as man, became conscious of His Messiahship, yet, if we accept the general history of the narrative as a whole, we cannot but admit that He did claim to be the Messiah, the Christ or Anointed of God, and this involved a claim on His part to be the fulfilment of prophecy.

Such, then, is the claim that is made upon us by our Lord, by the writers of the Gospels, and by some of those who are represented as speaking in them.

At this point it may naturally be asked : In what way and how exactly did our Lord fulfil prophecy ? and we may be asked to go into details under this head. Now it must be candidly confessed that, so far as the Gospels are concerned, we have very little of detailed particulars of fulfilment given us, in respect to the events of our Lord’s life. Perhaps the most remarkable is that of the prophet Jonah. There are many reasons that may be given for this. The Gospels cannot in any sense be said to be theological treatises : what they profess is to give details of the life and words and works of Christ. Further still, they naïvely confess that this claim of our Lord was not understood by His disciples whilst He was with them. An additional reason may perhaps be given that our Lord’s whole life was one consistent realization of all that had gone before, law, type, and prophecy. The old Christian Father saw this when he said : “ In the Old Testament the New lies hid, in the New Testament the Old is patent.” The evidence of law and type and prophecy is cumulative. It is not the one particular instance which convinces—that, especially in the case of a type, might be accidental—but it is when the whole sum of them is brought together that

the conviction comes home to us. It is a kind of inductive method brought to bear upon the individual facts. This was the way in which early Christian scholars read the Old Testament, and, though we may smile sometimes at their interpretation of individual texts and expressions—as, for instance, the interpretation of the number of Abraham's servants, or the application to Christ of the words describing the result of Samson's death, "So the dead which he slew at his death were more than they which he slew in his life"—yet still we cannot, I think, help seeing that this was due to their keen anxiety to show how a preparation for Christ was to be found throughout the Old Testament.

This may be said with regard to the Gospels as a whole, but it is when we come to the end of them that we find greater plainness of speech attributed to our Lord. Previously He had given a great proportion of His teaching in the form of parables; at the last they could say, "Lo, now speakest Thou plainly, and speakest no proverb, or rather, parable" (John xvi. 29). So it was with regard to the Old Testament: "He interpreted to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself" (Luke xxiv. 27). Notice the word *all* there: *all* the Scriptures.

Do any traces of that interpretation survive? We may ask first of all, I think, this general question: Where did the application of the Old Testament personally to Christ by the writers of the New Testament come from? It certainly would not come from Jews who did not believe in Him. This application is not limited to any one writer or writers. It must have had some common source. Various writings, in particular cases, all agree in attributing to the same passage its fulfilment in Christ. It would have required a wonderful harmony of mind for several writers to do this, unless there was a common source from which

all derived their interpretation. And where can we look for this source but in the Master Himself? No matter, for the moment, who or what He was, we must almost perforce trace it back to Him. When the Apostles and others in the Acts fall back upon the Old Testament to give them their great basis for argument with their fellow-countrymen this procedure must have been based upon previous teaching. It begins, from the very moment of the Ascension, with St. Peter's claim that words from the Psalms found their realization in what had happened to Judas Iscariot and in the appointment of a successor to his office. Later on, we meet with still stronger language implying that men of old in their utterances did not "look only for transitory promises." St. Peter (Acts ii. 30) in his exposition of the sixteenth Psalm attributes it to David, and says: "Being therefore a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins he would set one upon his throne; he foreseeing this spake of the resurrection of Christ, that neither was He left in Hades, nor did His flesh see corruption." They contain a bold assertion surely. Knowing what we do of St. Peter, and remembering that these words are attributed to him on the tenth day after, as he believed, he had parted with his Lord for ever, so far as His bodily presence on earth was concerned, could we imagine his having made such an assertion without some instruction from outside himself? His enemies in the Sanhedrin had no high opinion of his mental calibre. Of him and of St. John it is said they "had perceived that they were unlearned and ignorant men" (Acts iv. 13), and to them their words were a marvel. So again, St. Peter says a little later (iii. 18), the "things which God foreshewed by the mouth of all the prophets, that His Christ should suffer, He thus fulfilled." In the next chapter we have a definite recollection of

our Lord's own teaching : " He is the stone which was set at naught of you the builders, which was made the head of the corner " (iv. 11 ; cp. Matt. xxi. 42 || Mark xii. 10 ; Luke xx. 17). In the same way the reference to Psalm cx. 1 (Acts ii. 34) is a recollection of our Lord's reference to it (Matt. xxiii. 44 || Mark xii. 36 ; Luke xx. 42), and in both cases we have the evidence of all three Synoptic Gospels. St. Stephen's attitude is the same : " they (i.e. your fathers) killed them which shewed before of the coming of the Righteous One ; of Whom ye have now become betrayers and murderers " (Acts vii. 52). St. Philip, beginning from Isaiah (liii. 7) preached Jesus to Candace's chamberlain (Acts viii. 35). To Cornelius and his household St. Peter says of Christ : " To Him bear all the prophets witness, that through His name every one that believeth on Him shall receive remission of sins " (Acts x. 43). St. Paul takes up the same story at Antioch in Pisidia : " Of this man's seed hath God according unto promise brought unto Israel a Saviour, Jesus " (Acts xiii. 23). The indictment by St. Paul against the rulers and the people of Jerusalem was that " they knew Him not, nor the voices of the prophets which are read every sabbath " (Acts xiii. 27), and yet " they fulfilled all things that were written of Him " (xiii. 29). And then he goes on almost immediately : " We bring you good tidings of the promise made unto the fathers, how that God hath fulfilled the same unto our children, in that He raised up Jesus " ; after which he quotes the Second Psalm and Isaiah (lv. 3). And, what is more surprising still, and may be mentioned here, we find Apostles having the audacity, if we may so call it, to claim for themselves that they also are a fulfilment of prophecy (Acts xiii. 47) :

" For so hath the Lord commanded us, saying,

I have set thee for a light to the Gentiles,

That thou shouldest be for salvation unto the uttermost parts  
of the earth."

We hear, too, of the Jews of Beroea "examining the Scriptures daily, whether these things were so" (Acts xvii. 11). Once more St. Paul claims for himself that he said, "nothing but what the prophets and Moses did say should come; how that the Christ must suffer, and how that He first by the resurrection of the dead should proclaim light both to the people and to the Gentiles" (Acts xxvi. 23), and he follows up these words by an appeal to King Agrippa, "Believest thou the prophets? I know that thou believest" (Acts xxvi. 27). And when his journey ended in Rome, there also "he expounded the matter, testifying the kingdom of God, and persuading them concerning Jesus both from the law of Moses and from the prophets, from morning till evening" (Acts xxviii. 23); and the book of the Acts almost ends with a quotation by St. Paul from Isaiah, which we cannot help thinking he must have known had also been employed by Jesus, and applied to the people who would not accept Him (cp. Acts xxviii. 26 with Matt. xiii. 14 || Mark iv. 12, Luke viii. 10, John xii. 40).

I have gone into detail about the early teaching of Christianity as described to us in the Acts, because it shows that the following points were certainly insisted upon as a fulfilment of prophecy—the Davidic origin of Jesus, His passion, His Resurrection, and the coming in of the Gentiles, as well as the rejection of that teaching by so many.

What common ground, then, had the preachers of Christianity and their opponents? This, at any rate, that the Old Testament, in all its parts alike, looked forward to the coming of some one who was to be a deliverer of his people. That this was so cannot be gainsaid. When St. John the Baptist had preached for some time, "the people," we are told, "were in expectation, and *all* men reasoned in their hearts concerning John, whether haply he were



the Christ" (Luke iii. 15). If we are to believe the Gospel according to St. Matthew, and, as it was evidently written for Jewish readers, we cannot help believing it in this matter, the Jewish Sanhedrin, at the time of the Birth of our Lord, were quite ready to give an official pronouncement, drawn from the prophets, as to where the expected Messiah was to be born (Matt. ii. 4). And this expectation that the time of fulfilment of prophecy was about to arrive, seems, perhaps owing to the Dispersion of Jews amongst all the great centres of population, in Asia Minor, in Greece, in Alexandria, in Rome, to have attracted the heathen to a similar belief in a new Golden Age being near at hand.

In those early years of Christianity, Jew and Jewish Christian alike believed that the prophecies of the Old Testament looked forward to a person that was to come. The only question between them was this: The Jew said to the Christian, Your Jesus is not that person; the Christian said, I am fully persuaded that He is.

Now all this helps us, I think, to come to a clear understanding about the question I am now discussing. The manifold application of which prophecy is capable has been already insisted upon: its application to the needs of the time, and its further realization in the future are two distinct things. For instance, it may be granted, for the moment, as being at present the current view, especially as this is not a suitable occasion for going into a discussion of the point, that Isaiah liii. is of exilic date, and is intended to depict under the title of the suffering Servant of Jehovah the sufferings of Israel as a people. That need not hinder us from holding that the prophecy was capable of a still further interpretation and realization in Him who is called in the Acts God's "holy Servant Jesus" (iv. 27; cp. iii. 13, iv. 30).

The one great difficulty that beset the Jews and made



them blind to the fact that Jesus was "the coming One," was the conception that prevailed amongst them as to what sort of person their Messiah should be. That conception was material and in no sense spiritual. It was Jewish, not catholic ; i.e., it did not comprehend the eventual equality of Jew and Gentile as component parts of a spiritual Israel.<sup>1</sup> Since the return from the exile the Jews of Palestine, and particularly those of Jerusalem, had hedged themselves round with the Law and become an exclusive body. This is to be seen in the way in which they treated not only their neighbours the Samaritans, but also the rural and ignorant people of their own race. What had been handed down to them to cherish most fervently was the setting up of an earthly kingdom in Palestine, under the lordship of a true descendant of David. With that was to come prosperity. Jerusalem was to become the centre of the world towards which all people were to look, impressed with its glory and magnificence. A golden age, such as the heathen poets had also imagined, was to come in, a time of universal peace and prosperity. The reception of our Lord by the populace of Jerusalem on the first Palm Sunday proved this. The Jewish ruling class had so persuaded themselves of it that they shut their eyes to whatever could be said on the other side, especially because they trusted in the One that was to come to deliver them from the Roman yoke. It seems clear that no one in the Jewish world of our Lord's day anticipated a suffering Christ. What they did expect can be gathered from Ezekiel and the Jewish Apocalyptic writings. The Apostles had not the slightest idea of it ; they did not understand what our Lord meant when He spoke of His coming sufferings. The nearest approach to it on the part of any one in our Lord's lifetime is

<sup>1</sup> St. Paul, as we know, saw this fact clearly, and explained it in his Epistle to the Romans,

contained in the words attributed to the Baptist in the Fourth Gospel (John i. 29; cp. i. 36), "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world!" But this passage admits of more than one interpretation. It may, indeed, refer to Christ as about to fulfil the type of the Passover Lamb, and this is perhaps borne out by the reference to that lamb in St. John's account of the Crucifixion.<sup>1</sup> But others would make the allusion only a simile like that in Isaiah (liii. 7; cp. Acts viii. 32, 1 Pet. i. 19, "precious blood, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot, even the blood of Christ"), "as a lamb that is led to the slaughter . . . He opened not His mouth."

Now, however much they did this, it need not prevent us from seeing with the early Christians a wonderful realization of the prophecies of the Old Testament. Certainly Zechariah (ix. 9) anticipated a "lowly" king, in his words which have such an appositeness when referred to our Lord's entry into Jerusalem. And with reference to Isaiah liii. we can see in our Master the suffering Servant of Jehovah above all other of His servants. A Cambridge Professor has well expressed the position which is generally received now:—

"The whole religious history of Israel down to the time of Him whom Christians believe in as the Christ, and in a special manner the teaching of the prophets, formed a most remarkable preparation for His coming. It remains true as ever, and criticism and historical investigation only confirm it, that the Scriptures were in reality full of Him, and that, in proportion as men had entered into their spirit they must have been able to receive Him (John v.

<sup>1</sup> Or perhaps we may think of Genesis xxii., "God will provide Himself the lamb for a burnt offering." It is noticeable, in this connexion, that in Revelation (v. 6, 12; xiii. 8) mention is made of the "Lamb that hath been slain."

38, 39). It is still legitimate as ever to regard types and ideals which were first fully realized in Him as divinely intended to foreshadow Him " (Stanton, Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible*, iii. 357a).

When we regard the marvellous coincidences that there are between passages of the Old Testament and the accounts of the Four Gospels we shall, I hope, most of us be led, without always requiring the assent of others to each detail of our pious beliefs, to see many connexions between the two such as our fathers before us saw, and certainly, at any rate, those for which we have the authority of Scripture itself, as, for instance, the constant asseverations that the Death and Resurrection of Christ were the fulfilment of prophecy, as well as our Lord's own claims of this character.

Though we cannot require of any one that he should necessarily accept many passages of the Old Testament which seem to look forward to the New Testament, most Christians, if not all, would accept the following as capable of Messianic application or interpretation: the bruising of the serpent's head by the seed of the woman, the offering up of Isaac by Abraham, the Passover Lamb, the sacrifices and rites of the Levitical law—an exposition of some of these is given in the Epistle to the Hebrews—the brazen serpent, the prophet like Moses of Deuteronomy, Job's Redeemer (" I know that my redeemer liveth "), many of the Psalms, especially ii. (" Thou art My Son ; this day have I begotten thee "), xvi. (" Thou wilt not leave my soul to Sheol ; neither wilt Thou suffer Thine holy one to see corruption "), xxii. (" My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me ? "), xxiv. (" Lift up your heads, O ye gates "), cx. (" The Lord said unto my lord "), and cxviii. (" The stone which the builders rejected "), and also many passages from the prophets ; we may specify Isaiah ix. (" Unto us a child is

born"), liii. ("He was wounded for our transgressions"), lxiii. ("I that speak in righteousness, mighty to save"), Daniel ix. ("The anointed one shall be cut off"), Micah v. 2 ("Thou Bethlehem Ephratah"), Zechariah ix. ("Behold, thy King cometh unto thee: He is just, and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass").

But when we have to appeal to the Jew who has not yet acknowledged that the promises of his Scriptures have been fulfilled or realized in the person of Christ, what are we to say to him? We must plead with him on the general grounds of the paragraph just quoted. His Temple has passed away and perished from the face of the earth. The place which God had chosen to place His name in is gone. The sacrifices have gone with it. The services in which his ancestors took such a pride, with all their magnificence, are no more. There have been false Christs and false prophets: some even just about the time when Jesus lived. But let him examine carefully the records about Him Who is claimed to be the Messiah. Their general historicity is becoming more and more established. Let him compare the narrative with those parts of the Old Testament which speak of the coming deliverer. Let him try to divest himself for the moment of the idea that they must necessarily point to an earthly ruler, an earthly deliverer. Let him try, as some Jews have done, to understand the position of Jesus, and he will, at any rate, be led, to begin with, to form a higher estimate of Christ's work, His life, His character. The intolerance shown towards Jews by the Christians of some countries is an un-Christian trait in their character. The spirit of St. Peter in approaching His fellow-countrymen was far different from this. "And now, brethren, I wot that in ignorance ye did it, as did also your rulers" (Acts iii. 17). St. Paul says the same thing in the synagogue at Antioch in Pisidia; "they that dwell in Jerusalem,

and their rulers, *because they knew Him not*, nor the voices of the prophets which are read every sabbath, fulfilled them by condemning Him" (Acts xiii. 27). And in this they were but manifesting the same spirit as their Master, Who, when He was being nailed to the cross, said, "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do" (Luke xxiii. 34). Ignorance, then, as so often in the world's history, was the cause of persecution. "Had they known it" (i.e. the Divine wisdom), says St. Paul (1 Cor. ii. 8), the rulers of this world "would not have crucified the Lord of glory."

If we wish to see how some Jews of the present day are regarding our Lord, the following extracts concerning Jesus of Nazareth, written by a Jew, who is not a Christian and has, so far as we know, no intention to become one, and published some two years ago, will enlighten us. The main source from which he draws what he writes is the Talmud (Adolph Danziger's *Jewish Forerunners of Christianity*, chap. ii.).

"As Moses marvelled at the bush which burned and yet was not consumed, and approached to examine its nature, so I am drawn to examine the wondrous mystery of the life and death of Jesus to my fullest power of mind and in deep reverence.

"I seek to gather what it (i.e. the Talmud) tells of that life, so full of human charm and sweetness, of the individual whose sublime principles might have united all men, Jew and Gentile alike, under the banner of his Messiahship, had it not been for the errors and crimes of those who mistook his word and work and mission, and even in his name were guilty of deeds at which humanity revolts."

The writer then goes on to claim that Hillel's teachings had prepared Hebrew hearts for the gentle message of Him who followed. He continues;—



“The descent of Jesus from David, as set forth in the New Testament, is not disputed. . . . The Prince of Judaism and the Prince of the Christian world are of one blood, the race of David ; and the faith and hopes of mankind, whether Jewish or Christian, spring from a common fountain. . . . Granted that we as Jews reject certain points cardinal with the Christian faith, it cannot be denied that Christianity is a historical fact, and its existence to-day is directly traceable to Jewish origin through the New Testament. . . . The message (which Christ came to offer) developed, but did not contradict, the teachings of the great Rabbi (Hillel). . . . Neither had any part in the narrow local spirit which would make Palestine the only Holy Land in God’s world.

“Hillel is said to have said, ‘We carry a Temple in our hearts in which the Lord can be served and always and everywhere,’ and this while the Temple was still standing.

“There was absolutely no accusation that could be brought against Christ, under the law of Moses, of any important kind. . . .

“Over the supreme tragedy let the Angel of Sorrow spread his wings. Veil thy face, Sun ! Be darkened, sky ; let the earth tremble, and man mourn in tears ! The most angelic of men, the most loving of teachers, the meek and humble Prophet, is to die by the death of the cross.

“He has made humility honor ; he has carried the highest wisdom to the homes of the lowly and ignorant of the world. . . . The Redeemer of the poor, the teacher of the ignorant, the friend of all that faint with toil and are oppressed with cares, must die on the cross.

“Jesus died for the essence of all religion ; for purity, charity, and holiness ; for a cause in which death itself is a godly thing,



“ His fate is no secret to Himself. . . . The greatness which can speak in the face of torture and death as Jesus spoke ; which can return good for evil, love for hate, blessing for curses ; which not only preaches the law of love, but lives by it and dies for its sake, is a greatness before which every other fades into nothing.

“ The man Jesus is the most heroic, the grandest, the noblest personality of all time and age.”

And, in conclusion, the writer attributes the crucifixion almost entirely to the Sadducees, not to his countrymen as a whole nor to the Jewish teachers, quoting Nicodemus, and Gamaliel's words in Acts v.

If the Hebrew of to-day would but approach the study of the life and work of Jesus of Nazareth in the spirit of these extracts, very much might soon be done towards the clearing away of prejudices.

Let him but think that the Christian accepts all his Scriptures, as the word of God ; let him try to realize that it was out of the Jewish Church that the Christian Church sprang ; that that Church claims for its Founder that He was the one pointed out by the Jewish Scriptures ; that He Himself announced that His purpose was not to destroy, but to fulfil ; that the earliest Christian teachers were never weary of appealing to the Old Testament ; that they continued to worship in the Temple whilst it was still standing ; that almost ever since the Crucifixion the Temple and its sacrifices have disappeared, never to be revived ; let him see how in many particulars prophetic details were actually realized in the person of Christ ; let him try to spiritualize the ideas that he has in him of the future kingdom which was foretold ; then let him turn to the realities—the life and portrait of the character of Christ as it is historically displayed to us—and the effect upon the world of His life and teaching from that date to this, and he may

be led to the idea that there is more than he has ever thought of before in that Religion and its Founder. Occasionally through the ages, but less often as time has gone on, he will find the history of Christianity blurred by acts of bigotry and persecution ; but the good and the true have prevailed. Conviction may come to him as in a dazzling flash it came to his great fellow-countryman, Saul of Benjamin ; or it may come to him after long and painful mental struggle, so that at last he will exclaim : Thou hast conquered, O Nazarene ; of a truth Thou art the Messiah, the Son of God.

HENRY A. REDPATH.

### CHRIST'S PREACHING OF THE KINGDOM.

ALL are agreed that the subject of Christ's preaching was *the Kingdom of God* ; but there is by no means agreement as to the nature of Christ's view of that Kingdom. Hitherto the prevailing idea has been that, while He regarded the Kingdom as belonging in its fulness to the future, it was in its essence spiritual and was actually, in Himself, His preaching, and work, present among men. God was present in Him in His Grace, and men might become members of God's Kingdom now, partakers of a present, spiritual salvation. Of late, however, there has been a tendency in some quarters to regard His conception of the Kingdom as wholly, or almost wholly, outward and future, a Kingdom which was to come from God in a miraculous manner, agreeing in this respect with the popular expectations of His people and time. Of this view Professor Bousset's very interesting and suggestive book entitled *Jesus* may be taken as an example. According to him, after all modifications have been made, " the fact remains that the Kingdom of God as Jesus preached it lay principally in the domain of the future, and wholly in the domain of the miraculous." In keeping with this view was Christ's conception of Himself as the Son of Man and Messiah. He was to come again, outwardly and literally, in the clouds of Heaven as the Lord of the Kingdom. Now, of course, " History, the irrevocable march of events, have proved that the expectation of an immediate and mighty transformation " such as this outward and miraculous conception of the Kingdom (including His own coming again in the clouds of Heaven) implied, " was mistaken." The questions therefore arise : Is this view of Christ's preaching

well founded ? and, if so, How does it affect our view of His Person ?

To take the last question first, it may be said that if with respect to matters of ordinary knowledge Jesus showed Himself a true "Child of His time," this, in itself, would not be inconsistent with any view of the Incarnation or of the Person of Christ which holds that the Divine found its expression in that which was genuinely human. But unless, at the same time, with<sup>3</sup> respect to the highest spiritual conceptions, Jesus showed Himself to be above His people and before His times, what ground should we have for affirming the supreme presence of the Deity in Him or the uniqueness of His Person ? If our Lord had no truer knowledge than His contemporaries concerning that which was the central subject of His teaching—God and His Kingdom—we have no evidence, save His miraculous works, of a fuller presence of God within Him. That which distinguished Christ and was the supreme proof of the presence in Him of "the Spirit of the Father"; that which enabled Him to do the work that He did and seated Him on the throne of the world was just the spirituality which inspired His thought, His preaching, and entire life-work. It is suggested that His miraculous healing power was to Him the proof of the Divine Presence and of the nearness of the miraculous Kingdom. But His consciousness of the presence of God within Him was much more than this. The Divine Spirit was not manifested to Him only in the miraculous works He was enabled to perform. Jesus had a far higher thought of God than that of a miracle-working Power. There was something very much deeper than this implied in that exclusive knowledge of the Father by the Son and of the Son by the Father which our Lord is admitted to have possessed and asserted. The story of the Temptation alone shows that to the mind of Christ the

mere power to work miracles was not sufficient, that the true fulfilment of His mission depended on how that power was used, and that from the first the idea of an outward Kingdom was decisively rejected.

Bousset, indeed, earnestly and most convincingly maintains that Jesus had a far truer conception of God than those around Him possessed. [God was for Him "a reality, clear, living, present, above all others," and it was in this faith in God, the Father of men (although He was at the same time "a terrible God who filled His soul with a sense of His unspeakable majesty, and surrounded His whole being with impenetrable darkness and mystery,") that the power lay which enabled Jesus to rescue religion from the fetters of Jewish nationalism and make it individual and universal. But if this superior knowledge of God still left Him to entertain the thought that the Kingdom of God, the coming of which He preached as His Gospel, was something outward and miraculous, something which, in fact, never came, something, for us, "absolutely inconceivable"—not only does this seem contradictory to that high spiritual conception of God which is ascribed to Him, but it left Him subject to a strange misconception with reference to that which He regarded as His special "message" from and concerning God.

The contrasted views are really very different. To preach the Kingdom of God was to proclaim the coming of Redemption; it was to announce the glad tidings that God was drawing nigh to His people to save them. If Christ did not expressly say *how* this Redemption was to come, He made plain what it was from: it was from all the evils that afflicted the people in this life and from the sin that is the source of all real evil. The question is, Was it only a future, and not a present salvation that He preached? Did He merely call on them to draw nigh to



God and seek righteousness in order that they might be found among His people and share in a Redemption that was coming to them in an outward and miraculous manner in the future ; or, was the essential Redemption itself to be found just in this very drawing nigh to God, which made them members of the spiritual and eternal Kingdom and ultimate sharers in all its blessings ? Was it this spiritual and eternal salvation that filled the mind of Christ, or did He merely preach a future, external salvation in a Kingdom that was to come from God in a miraculous manner ? The question is very important. For, in the one case we should see in Him that deep spiritual insight which discerned in contrast to those around Him in what *salvation* really consisted. In the other case there would be the absence of such insight : the salvation would still be something external, to be found in a coming miraculous Kingdom, which, as a matter of fact, never did come.<sup>1</sup> In such a case, Jesus, with the spiritual conception of God and the realizing faith in the Divine Presence which are ascribed to Him, might still be rightly claimed as “the Leader of the ages and the nations to God,” but He would be made to stand lower than His followers in His conception of the nature of that Kingdom of God in which He promised men salvation.

Let us turn, therefore, to the actual teaching of Christ and inquire in what way He viewed that Kingdom of God which He proclaimed ; let us ask specially, whether or not He held a spiritual conception of it.

He certainly employed the popular forms of speech concerning the Kingdom. It was also a Kingdom which was to come in the fulness of its power in the future—a Kingdom

<sup>1</sup> In many parts of his volume Bousset maintains the spiritual nature of Christ's teaching ; but this seems inconsistent with that external view of the Kingdom which is attributed to Him.



that was to come from God and in God's own way. That He also pictured it in outward forms, as a Kingdom which men might enter or from which they might be excluded, cannot be denied. But Christ had to speak so as to gain the people's interest and attention, and the phrase "the Kingdom of God" was that which for them summed up the supreme good of man. By proclaiming the near approach to them of God's Kingdom He need have meant nothing more than that the highest hopes of the people might now be realized in their truth and the supreme good be found by them, that God in Himself was nigh them in that Grace of Forgiveness which all acknowledge to be the essential note of the Gospel in its permanent form. It may well have been the very spirituality of His conception of the Kingdom as inward and spiritual, and for that reason *always* nigh to men, that induced Him with so great confidence to announce its immediacy. The popular phrase "the Kingdom of God" need have been nothing more than a *form* in which He proclaimed the nearness to all of God, of the highest blessing in this life, and of the eternal life which they looked for beyond merely ; which were spiritual, not outward goods at all. But it was more than a convenient phrase. The Kingdom of God means also the *reign* of God, and it was only through the sole rule of God in the heart that man's highest good and real salvation could be found. Surely Christ knew this and taught this : it was the very essence of His teaching ; but if so, His own conception of the Kingdom must have been essentially spiritual. In this spiritual relation to God, men, according to Christ, did enter the Kingdom ; it belonged to them even now. The mere placing the emphasis on the fact that it was the Kingdom of *God* would not be sufficient. It depended on what was meant by *God* ; and Christ's conception of God was that of a spiritual Being, a present God

and Father to whom He invited men to draw nigh now and become His subjects and children, so that they might find the blessing of that Kingdom which all hoped for and which He proclaimed as real and nigh to them. What was this but the preaching of a spiritual good as the true good under the form of the Kingdom of God ? When Jesus spoke of the Kingdom as belonging to Israel, and of Himself as being sent to the lost sheep of the house of Israel ; when He even described the future as a sitting at meat in company with the patriarchs of the old Covenant, "all this," says Bousset, "formed but the mould into which His genius poured a new content." Is not this just what is true of the entire representation under the form of the Kingdom ? He represented that Kingdom in the popular modes of conceiving it ; but at the same time He made men realize its essential spirituality. When Jesus pictures the Kingdom of God as something local, to be set up in Palestine, an illuminated palace or a banqueting hall into which men might enter through a door, in which they should eat and drink with the patriarchs, or from which they might be shut out, beating at the door in vain for admittance, out of which the unworthy should be flung, bound hand and foot, into the outer darkness ; when He says that it is better to enter halt or with one hand and one eye into life than to go whole-bodied into Gehenna, is it not quite out of the question to take it all literally, and if it is not to be all so taken, who is to draw the line and say this is spiritual and that is literal ? The Kingdom of God was but a *form* in which Christ clothed His spiritual teaching. It was a good form, a most fruitful form, the best, doubtless, that was open to Him ; and it is still, perhaps, when freed from all that was merely temporary and accidental, the best form in which to present the Gospel ; but it was only a form, and to press it to the length of excluding its spiritual content is quite unwarranted.

It is admitted that the Kingdom was in some sense present in its beginnings—in the miraculous works of Christ, especially in His healings and castings out of demons. These were evidences of the presence of the Kingdom because they were manifestations of the presence of God in His reign and in His power over evil. But, apart from the special passages to be considered immediately, was not the very essence of the Kingdom also present in Christ's preaching of the nearness and love of the Heavenly Father, in the freeness of His gift of His Holy Spirit to all who asked Him, in the forgiveness of sins, in the rescue of the Sabbath for man, in the reversal of the old Law and teaching of the Sermon on the Mount in general, in the revelation to "babes" of the things that had been hid from the wise and prudent, in the things which many prophets and righteous men of old longed to see but did not behold, in "the word of the Kingdom" which was sown like seed by Christ, in the salvation of the sinful, in the joy in Heaven over repenting ones, and in the rest to the weary and heavy laden which was found in bowing to the yoke of the great Teacher? Were not men and women thus truly becoming, not merely members of the Kingdom who should one day enter it in an outward sense, but actual partakers in its Divine life and blessedness; while that which should bring this spiritual Kingdom in the fulness of its power still lay hid in the womb of the future and in the counsels of God? The Kingdom of God *we* know is in its truth the reign of God's love in the hearts of men. Did not Jesus know this? Can we really assert for ourselves a spiritual knowledge superior to that which He possessed?

Again, if we can trust St. Paul and the gospel narratives, the coming of the Kingdom of God was with Christ the same thing as the establishment of *the New Covenant*. That New Covenant, as it was described by Jeremiah, was

certainly spiritual in its content,—“ I will put my law in their inward parts, and in their hearts will I write it ; and I will be their God and they shall be my people ” (surely this is just the Kingdom of God ) : and we cannot suppose that Christ was behind the prophet in His conception of the essential spirituality of that which had to the people of His time become so sadly materialized. It was just here that He stood forth in such marked distinction from the people and their teachers.

We have already referred to our Lord's confident preaching of the immediacy of the Kingdom—His proclamation of it as something that had come nigh to the people. The question arises, What was it that gave Him this confidence—a confidence which He maintained unshaken to the very last ? To attribute it to calculations based on Daniel and other prophets such as many of the Rabbis of His time engaged in, would be out of keeping with all that we know of Christ. To say that it was His possession of miraculous powers would be inadequate. It was not this alone that gave Him the conviction that He was the *true* Messiah of His people. To ascribe His belief to a special inspiration would be psychologically insufficient ; for there is no inspiration apart from some reason for it—more or less clearly discerned. Is not the most consistent explanation of His confident proclamation of the nearness of the Kingdom His strong conviction of its essential *spirituality* ? That to which the people were looking to find their true good in was indeed the Kingdom of God. But that Kingdom was really in the first instance the reign of God in their hearts : out of that all other good would come. And God was nigh to them in His grace and forgiving love, seeking to enter their hearts and reign. They were making the great mistake of looking to the future merely for that which was ever nigh to them. Therefore, to this spiritual religion



Jesus called the people, saying, "The Kingdom of God is at hand."

It ought to be noted also that, although in the time of Christ the idea of the Kingdom seems to have been widely conceived in an outward manner, His use of the phrase in a spiritual sense was by no means unprecedented. In the Wisdom of Solomon it is said that Wisdom showed to Jacob "the Kingdom of God and gave him a knowledge of holy things" (x. 10). "Here," as Principal Drummond remarks, "the expressions are parallel, so that seeing the Kingdom of God is equivalent to receiving a knowledge of holy things; it is, in short, to apprehend the reality and meaning of the Divine rule in oneself and in mankind" (*Hibbert Lectures*, p. 129). The equivalent phrase "the Kingdom of Heaven" is frequent on the part of Rabbinical writers in a spiritual sense. In the words of Dr. Edersheim: "A review of many passages on the subject shows that in the Jewish mind the expression 'Kingdom of Heaven' referred, not so much to any particular period, as in general to the *Rule of God*, as acknowledged, manifested, and eventually perfected. Very often it is the equivalent for personal acknowledgment of God: the taking upon oneself of the 'yoke' of 'the Kingdom,' or of the commandments—the former preceding and conditioning the latter" (*The Life and Times of Jesus*, i. p. 267). See also Dalman's *The Words of Jesus*. He says that "no doubt can be entertained that both in the old Testament and in Jewish literature" the meaning is "always the 'kingly rule,' never the 'kingdom,' as if it were meant to suggest the territory governed by Him" (p. 94).

Coming now to the particular sayings which are noted by Bousset as those which are generally supposed to support the idea of a present spiritual Kingdom, we have—

1. Matthew xii. 28: "If I by the Spirit of God cast out



demons, then is the Kingdom of God come unto you." It is admitted that in the eyes of Christ the Kingdom of God was already present. But it is said that this was "spoken at a moment of great excitement, in which He likens His own miracles and casting out of devils directly to the miraculous power of God with which He would presently set up His Kingdom and trample Satan, the prince of all the devils, under foot." But this is mere assertion: there is no such comparison; He simply adduces the miracles as a proof—the only kind of proof they seemed capable of understanding—of the actual coming upon them of that Kingdom of which they had so much to say and which they were looking for in the future only. It seems an express repudiation of the idea that the Kingdom was only in the future. As Dr. Weymouth notes (in his *New Testament in Modern English*), "the verb employed (in 'has come upon you') is found nowhere else in the Gospels except in the parallel passage, Luke xi. 20, and probably implies, 'Before you were expecting its arrival,' which sense of the verb is retained in modern Greek. In Luke's version of the saying the meaning is plain: 'If I by the finger (or power) of God cast out demons, then is the Kingdom of God come upon you.'"

2. Another very important saying is Luke xvii. 21: "And being asked by the Pharisees when the Kingdom of God cometh, He answered them and said, The Kingdom of God cometh not with observation (close watching for it), neither shall they say, Lo here! or There! for lo! the Kingdom of God is within you." The margin of the R.V. gives "in the midst of you," and that of the A.V. "among you." As this saying has often been misinterpreted, it deserves fuller consideration. There is no apparent reason for the rendering "among you" (or "in the midst of you") save only a subjective one. It was first adopted, in all

probability, because our Lord's words were addressed to the Pharisees, of whom it seemed impossible to say "it is within you"—a general statement being taken for a particular one. The word employed by Luke, ἐντός, means "within" in contrast with ἐκτός, "without." It means always *within*, in whatever sense that term can be applied to that which is spoken of. No instance has as yet been adduced to prove that it may mean "among" as distinguished from "within." It occurs, in the New Testament only here and in Matthew xxiii. 26, where it indicates the "inside" of the cup or platter as contrasted with the outside of it. It is found five times in the Septuagint Version, Dan. x. 16; Ps. xxxix. 3; ciii. 1; cix. 22 (Biblical enumeration); Isa. xvi. 11; Cant. iii. 10. In the first four instances it can only mean *within* (in the Psalms, "my heart within me"); and in the last instance it points to the inside of Solomon's palanquin as distinguished from the outside of it. It is found also in the Apocrypha (Ecclus. xiv. 26; 1 Macc. iv. 48) with the same meaning. Dalman, retranslating into the Aramaic, holds that the rendering "within you" is the correct one—in the secrecy of men's hearts. "In other places Luke has ἐν μέσῳ for 'among': see Luke ii. 46; viii. 7; x. 3; xxii. 27, 55; xxiv. 36; Acts i. 15; ii. 22; xxvii. 21. When he writes ἐντός in this case, he certainly means something more than 'among,' namely, 'within'" (*The Words of Jesus*, p. 146). The few instances that have been adduced from Classical literature to justify the rendering "among you" entirely fail to do so. That from Xenophon's *Anabasis*, i. 10, 3, quoted by Alford (and frequently referred to by others both before and since his time), points to what was *within* the soldiers' quarters, and is so rendered in Watson's translation; or "within their own lines," as others render it. Dr. Plummer (who holds either rendering to be admissible) adds two more in-

stances, one from Xenophon's *Hellenes*, ii. 3, 19, and another from Plato's *Leg.* vii. 789, A (where it occurs twice); but in all these cases the meaning is certainly *within*—"within the womb"; "within (in the sense of taking under their arms)"; "bad men within the Three Thousand as well as outside it."

Of course, *if* the Kingdom were something outward, like the goods and people within the ranks of the soldiers in the *Anabasis*, it would be correct to say "in their midst"; because it would not be possible for it to be within them in any other sense. But this would be to pre-judge the nature of the Kingdom as outward, and also to assume that Christ was addressing them as a people or a community, instead of thinking of the relation of the spiritual Kingdom to the individual. But even "among you" would be quite in keeping with the idea of the spirituality of the Kingdom. As Alford, who adopts it, remarks, "The meaning 'among you' includes, of course, the deeper and personal one, 'within each of you.'"

"Lo here! or, There!" could only be said of what was *outward*. Christ here affirms that it could not be said of the coming of the Kingdom; but it is exactly what would apply to the sudden descent of an outward and miraculous Kingdom. That the exclamation applies to *place* is plain from the verses that follow (*vv.* 23, 24; see also *Matt.* xxiv. 23, 24; *Mark* xiii. 21); where the comparison of the Coming of the Son of Man to the shining forth of the lightning points, probably, not merely to the suddenness but to the universality and spirituality of His presence.

Bousset's remark that we have here again "an inspired and paradoxical saying of Jesus in which he was certainly thinking of his own actions, but in their miraculous, not in their moral aspect," as on another occasion He pointed the disciples of John to the wonders He had wrought, seems un-

founded, and, in any case, it would prove nothing respecting the real nature of the Kingdom. He suggests in a note that perhaps the right translation is, "For lo! the Kingdom of God will (suddenly) be among you," in which case the whole passage would refer to the future Kingdom of God. But we have already seen that it is "within," not "among"; and, surely, the sudden appearance of such a Kingdom "among" them would elicit the exclamations referred to.

3. The "Parables of the Kingdom" are generally regarded as teaching a spiritual view of the Kingdom of God. They are certainly parables *of the Kingdom*, in which it is likened to certain material things, and as certainly do they have reference to *the spiritual teaching* of Christ—which was like the seed sown in a field, or the leaven hid in the meal. Perhaps, in the parable of the mustard seed, which, Bousset bids us remember, was a garden-plant that sprang up in a single summer, there may be no direct reference to "the development of centuries," rather, to something "swift"; but, whatever the reference to *time* may be, it is the development, not of anything outward, but of *that which was sown in the hearts of men* that is spoken of.

No doubt, also, the merchant who parts with all for "the pearl of great price" does not find the full value of his gain in the immediate present, but he certainly does not "hazard all present goods for the sake of a future and yet to be acquired good" merely. That which he shall gain in the future is but the fruition of what has entered his soul in the present through his response to the call of Christ. And if, as Bousset says, in the parable of the peasant who casts seed on the earth and then can do nothing but await the harvest, "the emphasis lies, not upon the description of the gradual growth of the seed, but on the idea that the corn ripens to the harvest of 'itself,'" it was the ripening of the spiritual



teaching of our Lord that was in view—not the coming of a miraculous Kingdom.

There are other special sayings, besides those that are noticed, which convey the idea of a present spiritual Kingdom. Amongst these we may quote the opening words of our Lord's ministry according to Luke (iv. 17-21): "To-day hath this Scripture been fulfilled in your ears": to preach "the acceptable year of the Lord" was to proclaim the coming of the Kingdom of God. "Whosoever shall not receive the Kingdom of God as a little child, he shall in no wise enter therein" (Mark x. 15). It was something presently offered to them. "From the days of John the Baptist until now the Kingdom of Heaven suffereth violence, and men of violence take it by force" (Matt. xi. 12); the meaning of which is evident from Luke's version of the same utterance: "The law and the prophets were until John: from that time the gospel of the Kingdom of God is preached, and every man entereth violently into it." When He sent the seventy forth to preach, they were to heal the sick and say, "The Kingdom of God is come nigh unto you"; and, if rejected, they were to repeat the saying: "Howbeit, know this, that the Kingdom of God is come nigh" (Luke x. 9, 12). To the scribe that answered discreetly Jesus said, "Thou art not far from the Kingdom of God," which implied its presence as a spiritual reality. To His disciples "the mysteries of the Kingdom" were revealed, which were surely something more than miraculous healings; and He said, in words already referred to: "Blessed are your eyes, for they see; and your ears, for they hear" (it was not merely *seeing*). "For verily I say unto you, that many prophets and righteous men desired to see the things which ye see, and saw them not, and to hear the things which ye hear, and heard them not" (Matt. xiii. 11, 16, 17). What were the things that they *heard*, if not



those of His spiritual teaching, which was the seed of the Kingdom in their hearts ?

Bousset, of course, as already intimated, maintains that Jesus did much more than preach the coming of an outward Kingdom : otherwise the results of His preaching would be inexplicable. He liberated religion from its national limits and sent it forth on a new and higher course of life. " Though steeped in the eschatological hopes of his time and country, he yet succeeded in altering and purifying them at the critical point and in breaking through the limits which hemmed them in." But in stating the way in which Jesus did this he seems to render incredible what he has asserted concerning Christ's view of the Kingdom. The distinction in Christ's view of the Kingdom, he says, lay in this : that, while according to the people of His time the Kingdom of God was also the Kingdom of Israel, Jesus had no interest in the merely national aspect of the Kingdom, and placed the emphasis on the fact that it was the Kingdom of *God*. " What did fill His soul to the brim was the thought that God would come, that God would bear rule, that righteousness would conquer and good triumph." No doubt this is true ; but does it not refute the idea that Jesus in His own mind viewed the Kingdom as outward and miraculous and in the future merely ? If He thought of it as *God's* Kingdom and universal, He must also have conceived it as spiritual and present. No doubt God was yet to come in all the fulness of the power of the Kingdom ; but was not God thought of by Jesus as also *here* ? Was He not " the Father who is in secret ; who sees in secret and rewards openly " ? And, if the Kingdom meant *the rule of God*, then, surely, the Kingdom was truly present wherever God's rule was accepted.

It is true, however, that up to the very last Jesus looked to the future for the coming of the Kingdom, not only in

its Judgment-aspect and in its eternal form, but also in its full spiritual power. It should come with His own coming again after His Death and Resurrection. There were some of them who should not "taste of death till they had seen the Kingdom of God already come in power"; they should not have "gone over the cities of Israel till the Son of Man be come." He saw that His *death* was the necessary prelude to the coming of the Kingdom in its power. Then "all should be fulfilled"; then He should "drink the new wine with them in His Father's Kingdom." To the High Priest He said, "Ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power and coming in the clouds of heaven." He expected the Kingdom to come in all its power and glory immediately after, and as the result of that death which sealed to them the "New Covenant." It is certain, however, also, that the outward, miraculous Kingdom did not appear, and that Jesus as the Son of Man did not come in His glory in the clouds of heaven. Was Jesus then to some extent under an illusion? Was He disappointed in His expectations? But now, can we seriously suppose for a moment that one with the insight of Jesus really believed that He should come riding on the clouds of heaven? Is not this as manifestly a figurative expression, denoting His spiritual triumph (which the High Priest could not understand) as are the expressions in the eschatological discourse in Mark, where the sun is said to be darkened, and the moon to be turned into blood, and the stars to fall from heaven? No one in his senses would take such prophetic language literally; why then interpret similar language on the part of Christ in a literal manner? Christ *did* triumph through His Cross; the Son of Man did immediately thereafter come in the true glory of His Father, and the Kingdom did then begin to come in the fulness of its spiritual and eternal power. That sacrifice of Himself to which He had come

so to look forward, till the accomplishment of which He felt Himself so greatly "straitened," completed that which His spiritual teaching began. In the holy love which there poured itself forth ; in the message of forgiveness that was preached in His Name ; in the conviction of the reality of a spiritual life in God which came through belief in the Risen One ; in the new spiritual power—the fulness of the Holy Spirit of God—that went forth through the Cross, convicting men of sin and leading them to embrace the grace of God, who was there reconciling the world to Himself ; in the new life of love that was quickened in their hearts ; in the "righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit" that thus came to them ; in the inspiration to be co-workers with God in this life, and in the power of the eternal life which thus possessed them, with its "Hope of Glory," the Kingdom of God came, as Christ believed it would come, in the fulness of its power. It came thus as that spiritual, present, yet eternal Kingdom which, deepest of all, He saw it from the first to be, and therefore proclaimed its nearness and openness to all, although He found by experience that His sacrifice of Himself alone could bring it in all its Divine power. And that Kingdom still continues to come and will go on increasing wherever the gospel is proclaimed in its truth and fulness and the life of love is thereby produced. It is the failure to see how truly the Kingdom came in the fulness of its spiritual power through the Cross of Christ that leads some at present to so literalize the sayings of Jesus as they would never dream of doing with those of any other great religious teacher.

W. L. WALKER.

*DR. SWETE'S EDITION OF THE APOCALYPSE.*

IN the very interesting introduction which he contributed to Dr. Hort's Commentary on 1 Peter (alas ! incomplete), Bishop Westcott has told us how the famous triumvirate of Cambridge scholars had agreed to distribute the books of the New Testament amongst themselves with the view of preparing a complete Commentary. "The Epistles of St. Paul were assigned to Dr. Lightfoot : the Synoptic Gospels, the Acts, and the Epistles of St. James, St. Peter and St. Jude to Dr. Hort : the Gospel and Epistles of St. John fell to me." Two books were not finally assigned—the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse. "Dr. Lightfoot was unwilling to undertake the former, nor could I undertake the latter." It was a great scheme, and the parts of it which were carried out remain as a monument to the capacity of the three to have built up thus a great commentary on the New Testament. But, unfortunately for the cause of theological learning, Lightfoot and Westcott were successively removed from Cambridge to work, which made its further prosecution by them almost impossible ; and Hort died, leaving only this unfinished fragment of his work on 1 Peter. It is a cause of no little satisfaction that several of the gaps which remained when Lightfoot and Westcott laid down the work have since been filled by members of the same University, working in the same spirit and with the same scholarly thoroughness. We have had from Dr. J. B. Mayor the Commentary on St. James, from Dr. Armitage Robinson that on the Ephesians, and from Dr. Swete (Bishop Westcott's successor as Regius Professor of Divinity), an excellent commentary on St. Mark. It is the same scholar whom we have now to thank

for a commentary on the Revelation of St. John not unworthy to take its place in the same series.

"It seemed to us," says Dr. Westcott, "that the New Testament should be interpreted as any other book, with loyal obedience to the strictest rules of criticism, to the most exact scholarship, and to the frankest historical inquiry. . . . There were natural differences between us in the application of our principles : one looked primarily to the vivid realization of the original meaning of the text, another to the determination of the elements of philosophical theology which it contained, another to the correspondences of different parts of the Apostolic records which suggest the fulness of the vital harmony by which they are united." It is not difficult to assign the three distinctions to their respective owners. Dr. Swete, it need hardly be said, shares the common ground of his illustrious predecessors. He has the exact scholarship which has been the sign-manual of the Cambridge school, the minute attention to form and syntax, and the wide knowledge of what has been written by the older commentators, which they had ; and he places it all at the disposal of a reverent and intense desire to ascertain the original meaning of his author. It is no disparagement of Dr. Swete's method to say that it is more akin to the first of the three distinguished by Dr. Westcott than to either of the other two. A vivid realization of the original meaning of the text goes far to satisfy his ambition. As to the interpretation of the thought, he gives a wide selection from the suggestions chiefly of the ancient commentators, and for the rest inclines to leave the reader to form his own interpretation, by the application of the general principles which are indicated in the introduction. It may be doubted whether a somewhat bolder treatment of the larger problems of interpretation is not demanded by this book beyond all others ; and



whether, on the other hand, such treatment is not outside the reach of a method which, while resolutely sober and restrained by wide knowledge, is equally resolute in rejecting the possibility of "sources" in the text. This is the first English commentary on the Greek text of the Apocalypse prepared and provided with all the apparatus of modern classical and textual learning: it is probably the last of equal authority in these respects which will insist on treating the Apocalypse not only as a literary unity, but as homogeneous.

This is a distinction of vital importance for the interpretation of the book. The inner unity, of which Holtzmann spoke in 1886 as the foundation of all the more recent work on the Apocalypse, has since been effectively vindicated by Bousset and others. By that is meant the rejection of all theories of "expansion" on the one hand, and of "conglomeration" on the other. There was not at any time a Jewish Apocalypse which was transformed into our Christian one by additions and interpolations, neither was there a series of Apocalypses (Jewish or Christian) originally independent and subsequently combined. We have before us a "literary unity," in the sense that all the thought-material has passed through the crucible of a single mind. But that does not mean that all which is here presented was originally the creation of a single mind. Much of the language, imagery and symbolism of the book comes from a source which all can recognize—the Old Testament: and what is essential to a full interpretation of its message is to recognize that certain passages in it, from three to twenty verses long, have their origin in another mind, and are here adopted and adapted by the author for his own purposes. The true meaning of these passages, and their contribution to the message of the book, will be found in the discovery of the reasons why they were selected by the author, why

he deemed them appropriate for quotation, and how he adapted them for his purpose. It is this fact that we mark when we say that the book, though a literary unity, is not homogeneous.

The difficulties in which a commentator is involved who finds himself precluded from accepting this theory are evident when we turn to any of the crucial passages, e.g. the Two Witnesses, or the Woman and the Dragon. Commenting on the former of these, Dr. Swete rejects any historical reference, e.g., to Moses and Elijah or to Elijah and Enoch, also any allegorical reference to Law and Gospel or to Old Testament and New. "Rather the witnesses represent the Church in her function of witness-bearing, and her testimony is symbolized by *two* witnesses, partly in reference to the well known law of Deuteronomy, partly in order to correspond with the imagery of Zechariah." This may be, and no doubt is, a legitimate homiletic application of the passage; but is it a sufficient interpretation of it as originally written? Does it do justice to the very precise and minute description that follows? "These are the two olive-trees, and the two candlesticks, standing before the God of the whole earth. And if any man desire to hurt them, fire proceedeth out of their mouth," etc. The single point to which Dr. Swete attaches his interpretation is only one of many details: are the rest otiose? They may be so regarded, if we are guided by other indications in the context, and see here a quotation from an old prophecy about the Two Witnesses. The writer would then have taken over the whole for the sake of the leading idea, and of the transition which the passage provides to the figure, so important for what follows, of the Monster. The old commentators, patristic and mediaeval, were surely right in insisting that these two figures stand for two actual expected personalities, expected to appear in the flesh and

to be seen and known of men. If we cannot see how the details regarding them fit into the rest of our writer's scheme, then we have so much the more reason for following other indications in the passage, e.g. Hebraism in diction, abrupt transition to the prophetic style, localization in the material Jerusalem and affinity to familiar Jewish tradition, and tracing in the whole passage an older prophecy regarding Antichrist. If that were so, it would be the business of the interpreter to discover the point of contact between this passage and the writer's own scheme of the future, and the angle at which he sets the old in order to throw light on the new. The point of contact may be the indignities offered to the bodies of the witnesses, or, more probably, the mention of "the beast." Dr. Swete says: "The article assumes that this Wild Beast which comes up from the Abyss is a figure already familiar to the reader. Perhaps it points back to Daniel vii. 3, the Apocalypticist mentally merging the four in one." But Daniel's four monsters supply no true analogy to this single one, who for the Apocalypticist has no compeer, and is himself the sole source on earth from which other evil forces derive their power. And we may ask, is this the way in which a writer would introduce one of the two dominant figures in his book, if he were writing here his own thought? Is it not just the way in which he might introduce it if he were quoting from an earlier prophecy?

The Vision of the Woman, the Man-child and the Dragon is one which presents even greater difficulties when the attempt is made to interpret it as the direct expression of the mind of a Christian Apostle. Dr. Swete says that the Man-child is "primarily the Son of Mary." This is not a conclusion arrived at after stating and weighing other views, but a proposition which is advanced with the air of being self-evident; and it is supported by quotations from

Primasius and Bede. Of course, Dr. Swete is familiar with what has been written on the subject in the last twenty years, and could give his reasons for dismissing other views ; but it may be doubted whether his readers should be left to look elsewhere in order to discover that hardly any authoritative writer during that period has accepted this as the "primary" interpretation of the figure, or the passage as originally derived from a Christian source. The statement of Johannes Weiss is not one which can be passed over in silence : "The discovery of Vischer that the vision of the birth of the Messiah cannot have been conceived by a Christian remains, in spite of all hesitation and minimizing, an indisputable scientific fact." A conclusion so widely held and supported by so many arguments is not adequately met by the remark, "the Seer foreshortens the Gospel history." And the difficulties in finding satisfactory interpretations for the details of this passage are in their cumulative effect so great that the suggestion of incorporation from an earlier source comes to many as a great relief. The point of contact with the Apocalyptist's own visions is not the birth of the Messiah, but the descent of the devil to the earth, the explanation of his activity and his fury against the saints.<sup>1</sup>

It is the cumulative difficulty of finding an interpretation of these passages consistent with itself and with that of the rest of the book which makes us very unwilling to shut our minds to the suggestion of quotation. Dr. Swete comes very near to accepting it. He acknowledges as highly probable "that the author of the Apocalypse made free use of any materials to which he had access and which were available for his purpose." He admits "the presence in St. John's book of the conventional language of apocalyptic literature." "Phrases and imagery which fall under

<sup>1</sup> See Joh. Weiss, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes*, p. 79 ff.



this category must generally be held to belong to the scenery of the book rather than to the essence of the revelation." That being so, the question resolves itself largely into one of proportion. If we recognize foreign "phrases and imagery," why not also a few quotations of longer passages? There is nothing to impair the literary unity of the book in the use of such fragments of earlier material any more than there is in the use of images, phrases and symbolism which were not the creation of the author, but part of his religious tradition. There can be no doubt that the task of the Christian interpreter is greatly lightened thereby.

On the question of authorship Dr. Swete is much more open to conviction by modern arguments than on that of the composition of the Apocalypse. At the close of a careful statement of the evidence and of the difficulties in the way of the traditional ascription to John the son of Zebedee, he describes his position thus: "While inclining to the traditional view, which holds that the author of the Apocalypse was the Apostle John, the present writer desires to keep an open mind upon the question. Fresh evidence may at any time be produced which will turn the scale in favour of the Elder." This caution, though it may be unwelcome in some quarters, is justified by the extreme uncertainty into which all questions concerning the personality of "John" have come to be involved. There is a growing disposition to attach more importance than at its first discovery to the evidence of "de Boor's fragment," according to which "Papias, in his second book, says, that John the divine (ὁ θεολόγος) and James his brother were slain by the Jews." This comes as a confirmation of the statement to the same effect in Georgius Hamartolus, which it has been the custom to dismiss as an insoluble enigma, in the face of the apparently well established tradition that "John" died in extreme old age, and by a peaceful death.

It also calls up into effective activity a number of obscure hints which had sunk into obscurity, such as Eusebius' two tombs at Ephesus and Irenaeus' steady refraining from calling "John" an Apostle. Two obvious objections to the authority or accuracy of the fragment present themselves. Could any writer of the age of Papias be expected to give the title *ὁ θεολόγος* to John? According to Zahn, it was not applied to the Apostle before the fourth century. Dr. Sanday thinks "it may quite well be due to the fragmentist," while Schwartz boldly defends the use of it by Papias himself, explaining it by the fact that John describes Christ as the "God-word." The second objection lies in the order of the names, and in the obvious inference that the writer regarded the martyrdom of John as having taken place previously to, or concurrently with, that of Jesus, i.e. before or in 43-44. Against the possibility of this, we have the silence of the *Acts* and the statement of St. Paul in Galatians (ii. 9), where "John" must be one of the Apostles.<sup>1</sup> But the difficulty would disappear if, with Bousset and Jülicher, we take it that the order of the names is due not to the historical collocation of the martyrdoms, but to some other cause, such as traditional pre-eminence, which might well be effective after the lapse of fifty years. That there were two men bearing the name of John, of nearly equal importance in the eyes of the second century, we know from Papias. If one of them, the son of Zebedee, perished before A.D. 70, and the other lived in Asia Minor until the end of the century, it is certain that many perplexities would be removed. The position of the younger, called "the elder," would become much clearer. "There would be then no difficulty in identifying him at once with the beloved disciple and with the author of the Gospel and

<sup>1</sup> See H. B. Workman, *Persecution in the Early Church* (Appendix B), for a clear and forcible statement of the objections.

Epistles.”<sup>1</sup> But for Dr. Swete it would have the consequence which he suggests as not impossible : “ If the statement of Papias be allowed to enter into our calculations, it becomes a very important factor, for it disposes of the Apostolic authorship of the Apocalypse. If we believe it, we shall be compelled to attribute the book to an unknown John, who will probably be the second of the two who are named in the Eusebian fragment of Papias.”

The early date of the Apostle's death would have this result for Dr. Swete, because, following most of the more recent authorities, he accepts the late (Irenaeus) date for the Apocalypse. In doing so he departs, obviously and admittedly with great unwillingness, from the view which was strongly held by “ the great Cambridge theologians of the last century.” Bishop Lightfoot seems to have accepted the view “ which assigns it to the close of Nero's reign or thereabouts.” Bishop Westcott placed it “ before the destruction of Jerusalem.” Dr. Hort, in his posthumous commentary on 1 Peter, writes : “ There are strong reasons for placing the Apocalypse not long after Nero's death.” Dr. Swete's adhesion to the later date involves him in considerable difficulties when he comes to the interpretation of xvii. 10 ff., a vision which, as he says, “ seems to be dated in the reign of the sixth Emperor,” an Emperor whom he afterwards identifies with Vespasian. He has to suggest some explanation by which this date can “ be reconciled with the traditional date of the Apocalypse,” and for once looks longingly at the possibility “ that the Apocalypticist incorporates at this point an older Christian prophecy,” with alternative possibilities that he re-edits his own earlier work, or “ purposely transfers himself in thought to the time of Vespasian.” Saving the remote possibility of two editions, there is surely a dilemma here : either the

<sup>1</sup> Sanday, *Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 253.

author uses "sources," or the whole book, being homogeneous, belongs to the reign of Vespasian.

The reasons inducing Dr. Swete to accept the later date are set forth in the relative section of his Introduction. They fall under three heads. There is the early tradition connecting the book with the reign of Domitian, which begins with Irenaeus. Against this has to be set the fact that, "according to other early but not ancient authorities, the book was written under Claudius, Nero, or Trajan." With this late date Dr. Swete thinks that "the general situation presupposed by the book is consistent," but he fails to show in any convincing way that it is not equally consistent with a date thirty years earlier. With the Epistles to the Galatians and the Colossians before us, it is difficult to maintain that the cooling of enthusiasm or the prevalence of false doctrine necessarily calls for the lapse of a longer period to account for it. Indications of date of a third class are rightly found in the legend of Nero redivivus, and the cryptic allusion to Emperors in chapters xiii. and xvii. But while the former of these indications may be variously interpreted, there is a curious discrepancy in regard to the other between the Introduction and the text. In the former Dr. Swete says that "in chaps. xiii., xvii. Domitian is described in terms as plain as the circumstances allowed." According to the notes on chapter xvii., the vision seems to be dated in the reign of Vespasian, and cannot be taken at the same time as an historical description of Domitian.

Dr. Swete passes over several arguments in favour of the later date which have been alleged especially by Professor Ramsay, and which seem to the present writer of at least equal importance. And yet even the cogency of these may be open to question. Professor Ramsay's arguments may be summarized thus : (1) The Apocalypse looks



back over a period of persecution widespread and involving many victims. (2) These victims suffered "for the Name," and not on the ground of alleged crimes (*flagitia*), and therefore not in the Neronic but in the Flavian period. (3) The Apocalypse shows the Church and the Empire engaged in inexpiable war, and that is not consistent with the situation in A.D. 70. (4) It is most improbable that the Christians of Asia were at that date so highly organized in numerous congregations as they were when the letters to the seven churches were composed, and it is contrary to all evidence that they were at that time exposed to serious persecution and actual execution.

It is not a distinction without a difference to point out that the Apocalypticist does not regard the churches of Asia in his time as "exposed to," in the sense of already suffering from, actual persecution, but as about to be so exposed. He anticipates with intense vividness and conviction a persecution widespread and bloody: but he anticipates it. He neither assumes it as in progress, nor does he, so far as we can see, look back upon such a persecution within these churches of Asia at least as already past. Professor Ramsay quotes eight passages as evidence to the contrary, but only two of these connect the victims of persecution with any particular locality, and that locality is Rome (xvi. 6; xvii. 24). In xiii. 15 the reference is prophetic; in the other five passages it is entirely general and might very well be to the victims of persecution of which the churches in Asia had only heard, to those whose martyrdom at Rome had evidently made so deep an impression on the writer's mind. As regards the churches of Asia, the only definite allusion to bloody persecution already undergone is found in the letter to Pergamum, and the reference to "Antipas my faithful witness" (or martyr). Neumann's inference that Antipas was the only martyr that had as yet

suffered at Pergamum does still appear to be a reasonable one. The language of the context is quite consistent with a form of persecution which was not official and stopped short of death to its victims except in the one case which is singled out. Ramsay himself makes the remark that "on the whole surprisingly little space or attention is given in these messages to persecution": he might have gone farther, and pointed out that in the seven Letters there is no other reference to persecution unto death. These letters describe opposition, oppression, the need for endurance: they anticipate an advance on the part of the hostile forces to bloody persecution; but they do not go farther. Is not this absence of allusion to serious persecution as already experienced an argument for the early date at least of the letters? In that to Smyrna we find the anticipation of suffering thrown into the phrase: "Behold, the devil is about to cast some of you into prison": is that the way in which the writer would have described what was coming to a church which had already known a bloody persecution?

The argument to a late date from "persecution for the Name" as reflected in the Apocalypse also calls for examination. Professor Ramsay quotes four passages (ii. 13; vi. 9; xii. 11; xvii. 6). In only the first of these is there actual reference to "the Name," and there the reference to persecution is at best indirect. "Thou holdest fast my name, and didst not deny my faith, even in the days of Antipas, my faithful one, my witness, who was killed among you." In xvii. 6 the reference is to "the blood of the martyrs of Jesus," in the other two passages to "those that were slain for the word of God," and to those that "overcame by the blood of the Lamb and by the word of their testimony." Apart from any question as to the validity of the criterion applied, these passages appear to

provide but a slender basis for the argument that the victims of persecution recalled or anticipated by the Apocalypticist were martyrs "for the Name."

It is further said that inasmuch as the Apocalypse shows the Church and the Empire engaged in inexpiable war, it envisages a situation which is inconceivable as early as A.D. 70. But does not the book itself contain evidence which it is difficult to avoid interpreting in a contrary sense ? One of the facts most surely established in its interpretation is that the first Monster of chapter xiii. represents the Roman Empire and its heads (seven), the Emperors, in their predestined number ; further, that chapter xvii. elaborates the same imagery. These chapters were written, as Dr. Swete admits with regard to at least one of them, in the reign which was reckoned to follow that of Nero, that is to say, before 79. But these are the chapters which most emphatically describe the antagonism between the Church and the Empire ; and while Professor Ramsay's remark that "no such relation existed between the Jews and the Empire" disposes of the possibility of tracing these chapters to a Jewish source, they remain as a witness to the possibility that even in 69 a Christian writer could regard the Empire as the implacable foe of the Church.

Lastly, it is said that it is most improbable that at the early date the Christians of Asia were so highly organized in numerous congregations as they were when the letters to the seven churches were composed. That the churches were there we know, as to several of them, from the Epistles of St. Paul ; that those addressed in the Apocalypse were more highly organized than those to which the Epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians were sent, there is little or nothing to show. It may be an inference from a very doubtful interpretation of the phrase, "the angel of the Church." On this point Dr. Swete is admirably clear :

“Tempting as it is to discover in these ἀγγελοι an allusion to the rising order of the Episcopate, the invariable practice of our writer forbids such an interpretation.” Traces of developed organization may possibly be found in the assumed freedom and regularity of intercourse between the Christian communities; but it would be hazardous to postulate that as a feature which marked only the ninth decade of the century and not the seventh.

If the general objections to the early date of the Apocalypse seem to be less cogent than has been supposed, more weight may be given to the positive indications in favour of its earlier origin. We have already drawn attention to the silence of the seven letters on the subject of bloody persecution actually experienced as pointing to an early date. As to the central part of the book (iv.-xxii. 5) it is noteworthy how much of it bears marks of an early origin, xi. 1-11, xii., xiii., xvii., and probably xviii. Two at least of these passages are in all probability quotations from earlier, possibly Jewish writings; but the probability of their being so employed by a Christian writer is certainly greater at the early than at the late date. On the other hand, there is nothing in this central block to suggest, still less to demand, a date nearly thirty years subsequent to the date of xiii. and xvii. As regards the remaining portions of the book, the opening and the closing sections, the early date is rather supported than discredited by the form of the eschatological expectation. The writer plainly expects the end, the return of Christ, within a very short space of time. His expectation, both as to its date and its manner, finds its closest parallel in 1 Thessalonians, and its greatest contrast in the Fourth Gospel. Not that there is necessarily contradiction between the Apocalypse and the Gospel; but there is development, what Mr. Vernon Bartlet has called “a growing disentanglement of



the abiding 'eternal life' from the changeful forms of its earthly history." It is this progress in eschatology, among other reasons, which compels us to put a considerable interval between the two documents, while at the same time the stage at which we find it in the Apocalypse justifies us in assuming for it a date not far removed from the Pauline Epistles.

It may be pointed out in conclusion that it is at the early date of the Apocalypse that Johannes Weiss practically arrives at the close of a minute and unprejudiced analysis. The only large sections he removes are chapters viii. and xv.-xx.; when we add to the rest of the book the passages which he believes to be quotations from earlier sources or a Jewish Apocalypse, there is but little of the book left unaccounted for. He recognizes the work of an editor or redactor, but it is the great bulk of the book to which he gives the title of the Apocalypse of John, and concludes that its composition by a John of Asia Minor in the second half of the sixties is by no means impossible. His examination of the book leads him to set aside the tradition as to its date, which originates with Irenaeus, and it may be doubted whether, apart from that, it would have ever been ascribed to the reign of Domitian.

C. ANDERSON SCOTT.

## SCRIBES OF THE NAZARENES.

### II. THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. LUKE AND THE DESCENT INTO HADES.

IN the preceding articles of this series it has been suggested, that the earliest type of Gospel was simply a collection of passages, selected from the Old Testament. It was the work of the Evangelist to use them so as to substantiate in various ways the general proposition, that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah described by all the prophets. So long as the various facts, which corresponded thereto, were within the recollection of preacher and hearers, this sufficed of itself. But the store of necessary facts soon became enriched by the additions of successive students of Scripture, until it passed the limits of this common knowledge. The Christian missionaries believed that all the Scriptures were but type and prophecy of their Christ, or, at least, the material out of which He had fashioned His own more perfect teaching. They were therefore eager to discover and apt to isolate—if not actually to invent—incidents insignificant enough in themselves, which fitted such prophecies as were not obviously and notoriously fulfilled by Him. These facts were necessarily appended to the corresponding Scriptures for the benefit of less learned and less inquisitive workers. It is such a collection as this which justifies, chronologically at any rate, the pride of place accorded to the Gospel according to St. Matthew.<sup>1</sup>

In its present form this Gospel contains much more than these Dominical Oracles, of which Papias spoke. Before it was completed, the common knowledge of *what was not*

<sup>1</sup> The ten fulfilments of Scripture. Matt. i. 22 f., ii. 15, 17, 23, iv. 14 ff., viii. 17, xii. 17 ff., xiii. 35, xxi. 4 f., xxviii. 9 f.

*done in a corner* could no longer be assumed, by reason of lapse of time or change of scene. With the prophecies, therefore, were combined not merely the pertinent facts, which but for their pertinency might have been (and generally were) forgotten; but also the historical sketch of our Lord's life based upon the sermons, which St. Peter delivered *in partibus infidelium*. The first form of the Gospel is thus combined with the second, which is best represented by the Gospel according to St. Mark: the other constituents of the extant Gospel according to St. Matthew call for separate and detailed examination.

By the nature, then, of the whole or of a distinctive part of them, the accepted order of the first two Gospels is justified. And the third follows as naturally. St. Luke in his preface speaks as one of the second generation of Christians, and contemplates the needs of catechumens. In fact, the four Gospels correspond exactly to the works of Clement of Alexandria. St. Matthew is the Protrepticus addressing the Jews, and St. Mark the Protrepticus addressing the Gentiles; St. Luke is the Pædagogus, and the Gospel according to St. John is meat for the true Gnostic, who is described and addressed in the Stromateis. The last is first and the first last—for St. John, the only *eyewitness and minister of the word*, presents completely the slowly perfected interpretation and combination of the *things*—prophecies and facts—*concerning Jesus*.

But already in the Third Gospel fact and prophecy are, so to say, chemically combined, and not merely mixed. The process is defined for all time by St. John: **THEY BELIEVED THE SCRIPTURE AND THE WORD WHICH JESUS SPAKE**. As befits the eye-witness, St. John describes minutely at the beginning of his record the way in which the disciples of Jesus came to know Him for what He was.

Jesus drove out the thieves, who had made a shop of God's temple ; and the Jews demanded a sign from Him, a token of His authority to do this. The hawkers of sacrificial victims and the money-changers were licensed by the priests ; only a prophet, commissioned directly by God, might thus interfere with the existing order of things. But the only sign offered was an enigmatic saying, which the disciples interpreted of the Resurrection, *when Jesus had risen from the dead*.<sup>1</sup> For them, as for the two disciples who walked to Emmaus, *the prophetic word was more sure*.<sup>2</sup> Thus did St. Luke find his certainty by following up all the traditions to their source and guarantee in prophecy.

Of all the modifications of the record of Jesus' teaching presented by St. Luke, one of the most striking is his version of the parable of *the strong man and the stronger*. In its original form the parable is of sufficient importance as being connected by Irenaeus with the primitive Christian belief in the *descensus ad inferos* ; but St. Luke's version bears the marks of an elaborate exposition in the course of which, with the help of Old Testament Scriptures, this sense has been stamped upon it. *The word of Jesus* has been reinforced by *the word of prophecy* in the case of this pictorial representation of the consummation of God's sovereignty. The stress which the Christian missionaries and catechists laid upon this climax of "the last things" is as characteristic of Scribes, as the method by which they proved it. Ezra the great

<sup>1</sup> The view that the temple of which Jesus spoke was His body is perhaps the cause of the amplification of the parallel between the Son of Man and Jonah in Matt. xii. 39. The connexion of Psalm lxi. 10 with this incident supports the date assigned to the cleansing of the Temple by the Synoptists. The degradation of Old St. Paul's presents an exact parallel to that of the Temple.

<sup>2</sup> 2 Pet. i. 19.



Scribe had become the Seer ; and the Rabbi of Nazareth employed the current apocalyptic conceptions no less than the incidents of daily life, as vehicles of the spirit and the life which He proclaimed. St. Paul speaks for Christians generally : “ The apostasy must come first with the revelation of the man of lawlessness . . . *do you not remember that I used to tell you this when I was still with you ?* ” <sup>1</sup> The Son of God had spoken in divers manners to His disciples, and each one interpreted the word as best he could.

It is possible to separate this doctrine from the general body of Revelations to which it belongs and to regard it as an erroneous interpretation which must be discarded. Its alleged proof texts have been analysed and explained in other senses. “ Whether therefore we consider the authorities first introducing this opinion, which were apocryphal, or the testimonies of Scripture, forced and improbable, or the nature of this preaching, inconsistent with the Gospel . . . this preaching of *Christ* to the spirits in prison cannot be admitted as the end . . . of his descent into Hell.” <sup>2</sup> On this view the fact remains—robbed of its significance.

The opposite view accepts with simple faith the belief as it is now known to be reflected in the Gospel of Peter : “ As Jesus went up into heaven a voice was heard saying, ‘ Hast thou preached the Gospel to them that sleep ? ’ and an answer came from the cross, ‘ Yea. ’ ” Christ being dead, the Catechism of the Council of Trent says, His soul descended into Hades and remained there, so long as His body was in the tomb. *Ceteri . . . captivi descenderant : ipse vero inter mortuos liber et victor ad profligandos daemones, a quibus illi ob noxam inclusi et constricti tenebantur, ut*

<sup>1</sup> 2 Thess. ii. 3 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Pearson on the Creed.

*sanctos et iustos homines ex misera illius custodiae molestia liberaret eis que passionis suae fructum impertiret.*<sup>1</sup>

The former view is the reaction from the latter, in which the belief has become part of "the Romish doctrine concerning Purgatory [and] Pardons." But the primitive Christian church did not cherish doctrines which were repugnant to the Word of God ; and so long as popular notions of the life after death are determined by a literal and local interpretation of Jewish and Pagan imagery, this Christian pendant thereof deserves some consideration.

These emblems of the eternal struggle between good and evil—in the heart of man, in the world, in the universe—were part of the elementary teaching which the Scribes of the Nazarenes had received and delivered to their converts. They were "vocal to the wise," and at the same time contained warnings and promises, which the most ignorant could appreciate. Various degrees of comprehension of their meaning are found in the books of the New Testament ; and the doctrine of the *Descensus*, in particular, served various ends, as need arose.

Writing to sundry churches of Asia Minor of St. Paul's or unknown foundation, St. Peter makes casual reference to Christ's descent into Hell : *the gospel was preached to the dead*. The doctrine was perfectly familiar to the writer and his readers. He had no need to teach it or to remind them of it : he merely alludes to it because the object of the Descent is an essential part of his Theodicy. Only so could he justify the ways of God to men. Here was an intelligible solution of the inevitable problem *concerning them that have fallen asleep*.

In the church of Thessalonica this question presented itself in a special form. Absorbed in the hope of the

<sup>1</sup> *Catechismus Conc. Tridentini*, cap. vi. Quaestio i.—vi. : cf. Ps. lxxxvii. 6 ; Luke xxiii. 43 ; Hos. xiii. 14 ; Zech. ix. 11 ; Col. ii. 10 ; Phil. ii. 10.

immediate Parousia, those Christians were dismayed at the death of some of their number *that are fallen asleep in Jesus*.<sup>1</sup> But this was only one aspect of a larger difficulty : what of those who had never heard the gospel of Jesus Christ and yet had paid the full penalty of their sin ? Why was this generation singled out for God's supreme revelation of Himself in a Son ? If the rest must rise only to be condemned at the great assize, was God's judgment just ?

St. Paul is at pains to show that both Jews and Gentiles had enjoyed partial revelations of God's will ; and the Parable of the talents contained a promise full of hope for those who had been true to their little light. But the ordinary Christian naturally thought with Dives, that what had convinced him would have convinced his dead friends or ancestors, who had neglected either Moses and the prophets or the dictates of conscience. The whole world lay in wickedness : God was omnipotent : therefore God had shut all men up to sin. If His purpose was to save all, what of the dead ? Is God righteous in bringing upon them wrath ?<sup>2</sup>

Few were able to contemplate the body or nation as a whole without thinking of its individual members—*mentem mortalia tangunt*. Few, again, could find any solid satisfaction in a nicely-graduated scheme of recompenses proportionate to opportunities. But for all mourners there was hope in the doctrine that the Gospel was preached to the dead ; who, though they had been judged for the sins of their life, might yet live in spirit, if they heeded what they now heard. St. Paul's gospel was sadly incomplete if it did not include this provision, that the word of Christ had gone out to the dead also.

<sup>1</sup> 1 Thess. iv. 13 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Rom. x. 14-21

Earlier in his Epistle St. Peter asserts that it was Christ Himself who so preached, and, more, that He preached even to those typical rebels who had sinned, humanly speaking, beyond forgiveness. *He went and preached unto the spirits in prison who disobeyed once on a time . . . in the days of Noah.*<sup>1</sup>

Once more he clearly refers to an accepted belief. The spirits are the sons of God who, in violation of the law of their being, descended to earth and took to themselves wives, according to the old legend preserved in Genesis and elaborated in Jewish tradition.<sup>2</sup> To them Christ preached and they repented; for St. Peter goes on to say that He has *gone into heaven, angels and authorities and powers having subjected themselves unto Him.*<sup>3</sup> And if they repented, how much more readily the men of old who had sinned and died—like Adam in their death, if not also in transgression of a definite command?

The scribe is so confident that we may reasonably expect to find him following his Rabbi at this point—saying in effect, with St. Paul, “Not I, but the Lord, taught thus and thus, and so ye believed.” This warrant—the word of Jesus combined with the prophecy of “Enoch”—is not far to seek. One of the outstanding features of the life of Jesus is His expulsion of demons from afflicted persons; and this kind of miracle, whether performed by Himself or His Apostles, is regarded as an acted parable, significant of the conflict with the powers of evil, which He and they carried on throughout their career. So when the seventy Apostles returned with joy, saying, “Even the devils are subjected—subject themselves—to us as Thy representatives,” Jesus said, “While you were absent on your mission

<sup>1</sup> 1 Pet. iii. 19 f.

<sup>2</sup> Especially in the Books of Enoch.

<sup>3</sup> 1 Pet. iii. 22.



I was beholding Satan fallen out of heaven like lightning.”<sup>1</sup> Already the triumph was complete to His view, when His followers so proved their faith.

At the outset of His public ministry He told His disciples that the devil had tempted Him and had not succeeded in turning Him aside from the path laid down for the Messiah in Scripture. From the first, then, His victory was complete: the temptation might be renewed, but only to fail again: all that was necessary was that His followers should realize the fact and act upon it.

These exorcisms exemplified His triumph in a way calculated to impress the dullest intelligence. And their significance is set forth in a parable.

Scribes came from Jerusalem and said, “He is casting out demons with the help of the ruler of the demons.” Jesus replied that the theory was preposterous. “How can Satan so by deputy cast out Satan his agent? If a kingdom is divided against itself, that kingdom cannot stand; and if a household be divided against itself, that house will not be able to stand; and if Satan has risen against himself and is divided, he cannot stand, but comes to an end. This *has* happened, but not *thus*. Satan’s sovereignty is finished, but not through such domestic treachery. No one can enter the house of the strong man and plunder his goods, unless first of all he bind the strong man: then indeed will he plunder his house. I cast out devils, because I have first vanquished their lord Beezebul, *the Lord of the House*.”

Primitive Christians conceived of the earthly life of our Lord as a drama, in which His activities succeeded one another in order of time. In the flesh He preached to the Jews in Palestine—time and place the so-and-so; in the spirit He preached even to the disobedient spirits, whose

<sup>1</sup> Luke x. 17 f.

baneful presence He had banished seriatim from the upper world. But the parable admits no such distinction and emphasizes the logical to the exclusion of the accepted chronological order. If Jesus cast out one or many demons from one demoniac, it was only because He had already vanquished and bound their ruler, from whom they had their power. The disciples who had known Christ after the flesh were at a loss to explain this, except as a prophecy, so far as the complete achievement was concerned. On earth He delivered Satan's victims, and when He died He continued this work below; for Satan was emphatically *he that hath the power over death*. Even to St. Paul Christ's triumph over the lord of death was only to be achieved somewhen in the future.

This conception reflects the common habit of mind, which prevailed in the early Church. The disciples did not all or all at once understand the lesson of the Transfiguration. For them the glory followed the sufferings<sup>1</sup>; but St. John had learned to find in his memories of the earthly life of Jesus manifestations of the glory, which is to be manifested at the end of this age, and read aright this parable. Already the Holy War, on which the Apocalyptic writers laid so much stress, was accomplished; Jesus said, *Be of good cheer; I have overcome the world: the prince of this world hath been judged, shall now be expelled.*"<sup>2</sup>

By right of conquest, and not by collusion, Jesus plundered the vessels of Satan, carried off the bodies of the demoniacs, which had been seized by the reputed lord of this world as his prize.

The change which St. Luke introduces into the saying, which precedes the parable in St. Matthew's narrative and his own, is a clear example of his method. For *the spirit*

<sup>1</sup> E.g. 1 Pet. i. 11.

<sup>2</sup> John xvi. 33, 11, xii. 31.

of God he writes *the finger of God*.<sup>1</sup> This small change at once points to the parallel scene in Old Testament history, which the scribe regards as a type or prophecy now fulfilled. Moses foretold that God would send a prophet like himself. Many still cherished that conception of the Messiah, and were ready to welcome Jesus as such. This incident is one of the pieces of evidence, which definitely support their view. Of old Moses performed marvels before Pharaoh and the magicians copied them by their art. So now Moses' successor demonstrated His almighty power in works of mercy, and the Jews attempted to expel demons just as he did—even stealing His name to be their formula. But the magicians failed at last to imitate the works of God's Apostles, and cried out, *This is the finger of God*.<sup>2</sup> Accordingly Jesus here says (or is made to say) that "*I in the FINGER of God cast out demons* ; and proceeds to describe in a striking parable<sup>3</sup> the inadequacy of the healings performed by His rivals. The pupils of the Scribes have not first bound the strong man as He has done : in no sense have they conquered the evil one. Therefore their boasted healings are only temporary : they cannot replace the unclean spirit with the Spirit of God. So the last state of their patients is worse than the first.

St. Luke's version of the Parable of the Strong Man<sup>4</sup> suggests that here more than one prophecy or type is fulfilled. The *strong man* becomes an *hoplite* fully armed ; his *house* a *court* or palace, which he guards ; the *vessels* are described as his *property*, his *panoply*, and his *spoils*. A stronger comes upon him and overcomes him, strips him of his armour, and distributes his spoils.

The parable has become unmistakeably a description of

<sup>1</sup> Luke xi. 19.

<sup>2</sup> Exod. viii. 15.

<sup>3</sup> Luke xi. 24-26.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

the Harrowing of Hell through the influence of the Scripture upon the original Word.

In the first place, the substitution of σκῦλα (*spoils*) for σκεύη (*vessels*) points to the prophecy on which the parable is based. *Shall the prey be taken from the mighty or the captives of the terrible be delivered? But thus saith the Lord: the captives of the mighty shall be taken away and the prey of the terrible shall be delivered; for I will contend with him that contendeth with thee, and I will save thy children.*<sup>1</sup> The Septuagint version is nearer to the parable: "Shall one take from a giant spoils? and if one take captive unjustly, shall he be saved? Thus saith the LORD: If one take captive a giant, he shall take spoils; moreover, taking from a mighty man, he shall be saved . . ."; and the currency of this version is attested by the imitation in the Psalms of Solomon: "A man shall not take spoils from a man of might."<sup>2</sup> The *spoils*, then, are not merely the panoply, but also the prisoners whom Satan held captive in this world or in the world of the dead.

Next, God's champion *distributes* these spoils. This also in accordance with prophecy; for it is written: *He shall divide the spoil of (with) the strong because he poured out his soul unto death.*<sup>3</sup> And St. Paul makes the same point in a passage which seems to refer to the Descent into Hades: "Therefore it is said, *After going up on high, He led captivity captive: He gave gifts unto men.* Now, what does the word *he went up* mean except this: that he also descended into the lower regions of the earth?"<sup>4</sup> The Scripture which St. Paul quotes is taken from the 67th Psalm.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Isa. xlix. 24 f. μὴ λήψεται δέ τις παρὰ γίγαντος σκῦλα; . . . λαμβάνων παρὰ ἰσχύοντος σωθήσεται.

<sup>2</sup> Ps. Sol. v. 4: οὐ γὰρ λήψεται σκῦλα ἄνθρωπος παρὰ ἀνδρός δυνάτου.

<sup>3</sup> Is. liii. 12 (LXX. : καὶ τῶν ἰσχυρῶν μεριεῖ σκῦλα).

<sup>4</sup> Eph. iv. 8 f.

<sup>5</sup> Ps. lxxvii. (lxxviii.) 19. The Hebrew has . . . *received gifts* (LXX. ἔλαβες : the Targum refers the passage to Moses: "Thou didst ascend up to the



Already three prophecies present themselves as proof-texts of this doctrine, current in the early Church ; and therefore as factors in the development of the original parable. Hades was spoiled at the Passion of the Beloved ; and its spoils were distributed among the apostles of Christ, who must take up His work and guard what He has won.

Thirdly, the description of the scene of this victory falls to be considered. It is no longer a mere house, but an *aula*, a hall. This change is of itself sufficient to point to the interpretation put upon the parable by St. Luke and probably to the word used by Jesus *Zebul*.

In the Septuagint the word *aula* (αὐλή) is chiefly used of the Tabernacle and the Temple. In this usage, which is followed in the Apocalypse, there is a partial explanation, at any rate, of the choice of this word. The Tabernacle or Temple was God's House or Hall. The Jews had made it their house, and therefore it was left to them desolate. And the Jews were thieves, sons of the devil. So Jesus must enter the hall over which the enemy watched and purge it—as He did.

In the New Testament the word *aula* is appropriated for the most part to the hall of the High Priest's house, where Jesus was tried and denied by His trusted and confident disciple. Here also there is good reason for the choice of a word pregnant with such associations to every Christian. The High Priest was the ruler—not of devils perhaps, though some of his line desired to exhibit their authority over them<sup>1</sup>—but of the Jews whom Jesus pronounced to be children of the devil. In his hall, if anywhere on earth, Satan, the ruler of this world, held sway. There St. Peter, who had played agent

firmament, O prophet Moses, thou tookest captives captive . . . thou gavest the words of the law as gifts to the children of men."

<sup>1</sup> Acts xix. 14.

to Satan at Cæsarea Philippi, yielded to the noxious influence of the place, in order that his faith might be born again. There, alone and unfriended, Jesus confronted the *power of darkness* and submitted to be vanquished for the moment, that He might crush His conqueror for ever.<sup>1</sup>

But the other use of *aula* in the New Testament is specially significant, because it points to another passage where Jesus seemed to speak of the need that He should descend to Hades and preach there also the Kingdom of God. Arising out of the healing of the man born blind, there is a piece of teaching recorded only by St. John: *Jesus said: For judgment I came into this world, that they who see not might see, and that they who see might become blind.*"<sup>2</sup> There were certain Pharisees with Him, professed teachers and directors of the people, who had so far followed the Rabbi or the Prophet of Nazareth. These, perceiving the obvious double meaning of the saying, protested: other teachers of the blind-fool multitude might, as this new teacher suggested, have become blind to the import of His message and mission; but they themselves, who had followed the gleam at risk of excommunication,<sup>3</sup> surely they might say, "We see." Suddenly Jesus turns to another of their traditional titles: they were not only "the leaders of the blind," but also the shepherds of Israel.<sup>4</sup> As such they must enter the *aula* by the door which God appointed; else were they thieves and robbers like those, who would excommunicate them for their tentative allegiance to Jesus. They did not understand His words any more than the Pharisees who beset His brother with the question, "What is the door of Jesus?"<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. 1 Cor. ii. 8, "the lords of the world who crucified."

<sup>2</sup> John ix. 39 ff.

<sup>3</sup> John ix. 22.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Ezek. xxvi.

<sup>5</sup> Eus. *H.E.* ii. 23; cf. Ps. cviii. 19 f.

The figures employed in the allegory shift quickly. Jesus first enters by the door, and then is Himself the door. But throughout these dissolving scenes one principle is clearly enforced, the true shepherd must lose his life in order to save others. To Him who died for the sins of the world and for none of His own the porter of the hall opens <sup>1</sup> and He leads the sheep out. The fold or hall is as yet the world; but later Jesus speaks of other sheep which are not of this fold or hall. To His hearers the inference must have been clear: He spoke of His preaching to the dead in Hades. And if St. Luke was acquainted at all with Greek literature, he would naturally incline to use the word, for Alcestis went to the hall of the dead, and Heracles—type of Christ for pagan audiences—went down to deliver her from it.

Again, before the coming of the Stronger it is said that the *property of the strong was in peace* (ἐν εἰρήνῃ ἔστιν τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῦ). The dead are Satan's property, if the word be taken in its ordinary sense; and it is written, *The souls of the righteous . . . are in peace.*<sup>2</sup> But a contrast is implied between their state before and their state after the coming of the Stronger; and this demands another interpretation, etymologically legitimate, of τὰ ὑπάρχοντα as *underlords* or *subordinates*. Before Jesus came to expel them, the demons, who acknowledged Beezebul or another as their ruler and lord, were in peaceful possession of the demoniacs. They had their interval of peace, and resented their expulsion by Jesus and His disciples. Apart from the bodies of their victims they could find no rest, and protested, *Art thou come to torment us before the appointed*

<sup>1</sup> John x. 11; cf. Job xxxviii. 17, associated with the Descent in the dated Creed of Sirmium.

<sup>2</sup> Sap. iii. 1 ff.: for linguistic parallel v. Sir. xli. 1, εἰρηνεύουσιν ἐν τοῖς ὑπάρχουσιν.

*time?* Either interpretation suits the context; the only difference is that the first insists upon the reference of the parable bodily to the Descent, while the second directs attention to its original purport.

But, lastly, it is not only prophecies which dictated St. Luke's modifications. The History, as the Greek Fathers called it, the type here fulfilled by Jesus, has made its influence felt just as in the substitution of *the finger* for *the Spirit of God* above.

If He was Messiah, He was the Son of David, and must therefore do the works of David.<sup>1</sup> Now, in the record of David's early life, the chief facts are that he was a shepherd who vanquished two enemies—Goliath and Saul. The Johannine saying, *I am the Good Shepherd*, shows that Jesus consciously fulfilled the type in one respect; and here by St. Luke the latent reference to the parallel of Saul and David, his armour-bearer (*αἶρων τὰ σκεύη αὐτοῦ*), has been elucidated: traits belonging to Goliath have been superimposed upon Saul to make a composite figure corresponding to the enemy and his myrmidons who confronted Jesus.<sup>2</sup> Thus the strong man is fully armed with the panoply of Goliath and that of Saul, which David declined; and the distribution of spoils fulfils David's boast, *I will this day give the dead of the army of the Philistines to the birds of the heavens*, and transcends its first achievement, *David took the head of Goliath and brought it to Jerusalem, and he put the armour in his tent*. Saul was rejected because he kept back the spoils of Amalek, which David afterwards distributed. And the attack of the lion found its fulfilment in the onset of the roaring Devil, who found nothing in David's greater Son. There is a significant echo of David's answer to Goliath's challenge in the narrative of the Arrest of Jesus. David said: "You

<sup>1</sup> Cf. John viii. 39.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Sam. xvi. 21 = Mark.



come to me with a sword and a spear and a javelin, but I come to you in the name of Jehovah." Jesus said : " Did ye come out as against a robber with swords and clubs to arrest Me ? There in the Garden the lists were set for the combat between the Son of David and His enemy, and He repudiated the arm of flesh and the hosts of the heavenly army, as David did in a figure. The end is victory ; the binding of the Strong Man<sup>1</sup> is omitted as part of the Apocalyptic ideas connected with the combat, which had been fulfilled and understood as parable. St. Luke has outgrown the idea of an earthly millennium.

There is no lack of prophetic testimony in support of this doctrine. Some passages have already been indicated, and it is probable that the references to *those afar off* were interpreted of *the dead* and not of the Gentiles, except by St. Paul. Such interpretation would explain why the Apostles generally were so slow to recognize their duty towards the Gentile world at the first. One passage, for example, which St. Paul adapted to support his universalism, is more obviously appropriate to the ordinary view : *He came and preached peace to you the far-off and peace to the near.*<sup>2</sup> Passages, again, which spoke of *dead* and *darkness*, were not always glossed with the addition, *in trespasses and sins*.

But of all prophecies available, there is one which is free from ambiguity and specially important, as showing that this belief was no stranger to contemporary Judaism any more than to the Greeks who cherished the legends of Orpheus and Heracles. It is written : *Now the Lord God, the Holy One of Israel, remembered His dead who slept in the dust of the earth, and descended to them to proclaim to them His salvation.* Justin<sup>3</sup> affirms that the passage stood

<sup>1</sup> Apoc. xx. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Eph. ii. 17 = Is.

<sup>3</sup> Justin, *Dial.* 72.

in the book of Jeremiah, and was excised by the unscrupulous guardians of God's Oracles in their zeal against Christianity. Irenaeus<sup>1</sup> cites it once as Isaiah's, once as Jeremiah's, and three times without any name. Justin's opponent, Trypho the Jew, pronounced it incredible that this prophecy should have been burked, as Justin alleged; and now few Christians, however devoted to the Fathers, would support the allegation. None the less, it is possible that Justin was right. It is not necessary to assume that the testimony was originally part of the prophecies either of Jeremiah or of Isaiah; but there is every reason to suppose that it may have been part of the traditional Jewish exposition of the prophets, which is crystallized in the written Targum and Midrash. Words and thought alike are the genuine utterance of some later prophet like "Daniel," who had seen the righteous cut off before their time and had been driven to take refuge in the hope of another life. It is a protest against the old orthodoxy, which held that this life is all and the dead forgotten. Men might and should forget after a decent mourning—as Ben Sira taught; but God remembers His own; and if they die before His salvation be made ready, then He will wake and raise them Himself.

The description of Jehovah as *the Holy One of Israel* betrays a Jewish hand, and the phrase, *asleep in the dust of the earth*, stamps the whole as a translation from a Hebrew or Aramaic original. Indeed, the difference between the Semitic and the Greek idioms has misled the

<sup>1</sup> iii. 22 (Harvey, ii. p. 108): iv. 36 (*ib.* p. 228); iv. 50 (*ib.* p. 256); 55 (*ib.* p. 267); v. 31 (*ib.* p. 411). In iv. 50 it is coupled with Isa. xi. 12 with an addition which seems to support the interpretation of John x. 16 suggested above: *Congregans autem dispersos filios a terminis terra in ovile Patris et re commemoratus mortuorum suorum qui ante dormerant et descendens ad eos uti erueret eos*—such is the climax of the first of the two advents of Christ which the prophets announced.

translator, as it misled many of the Seventy ; and he wrote *εἰς γῆν χώματος* instead of *ἐν γῆς χώματι*, *the earth of dust* for *the dust* (or *mound*) *of earth*. Further, his version agrees with that adopted by Theodotion in rendering the great passage about the resurrection in the book of Daniel<sup>1</sup> : *And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life*. If they awake, they must be roused by some one, and the function is clearly God's. For reverence, be it understood, the seer forbore to mention His name. Therefore this unknown son of the prophets expounded the text, as he understood it, in the light of other prophecies which were all too readily limited to the Dispersion. So, too, the author of 4 Esdras said in the name of Jehovah : *Et resuscitabo mortuos de locis suis et de monumentis educam illos quoniam cognovi nomen meum in illis* ; and again, *Filios tuos dormientes memorabor, quoniam ego eos educam de latibulis terrae et misericordiam cum illis faciam, quoniam ego misericors dicit Deus Omnipotens*.<sup>2</sup> God must triumph over Satan. Wherever the usurper held sway—in the heart of man, on earth, in the Hall of the Dead—God sends His champion thither to overthrow his tyranny. Michael must fight with the Dragon : the Wisdom of God must *penetrate the depth of the abyss and all the lower parts of the earth, must visit all that sleep and illumine all that hope in Jehovah*.<sup>3</sup> So Christ descended into Hades *to contend with the contender*. There was no sword in His hand save that of the Spirit of Holiness : sinless, He proclaimed the sovereignty of God and at His word men were quickened as in the beginning. Even the spirits, to whom God had hitherto denied His peace, heard it and repented that they had sinned and made men to sin. And Adam the first transgressor among men awaked from his sleep to see the

<sup>1</sup> Dan. xii. 2.<sup>2</sup> 4 Esdras ii. 16, 31.<sup>3</sup> Sir. xxiv. 45 (Old Latin).

light of Christ. *He went and preached peace to them that were afar off.*<sup>1</sup>

The Gnostics might deride the belief as mythological and explain the descent as the Incarnate life of Christ. But the prophecies are not exhausted by such interpretation ; nor can they all be set aside as apocryphal. That which was spoken through Esaias the prophet was fulfilled : *Land of Zebulon and land of Nephthalim . . . to them that sit in Death's country and shadow, Light dawned for them.*<sup>2</sup> For Zebulon is the dwelling-place of the Strong One and Naphtali is God's wrestlings. And if any hold that Hades be not under the earth, that the Prince of Evil be in the air above, then must the light dawn there also and Christ's wrestling be not with flesh and blood but with the spiritual hosts of wickedness in heavenly places as with the world rulers of this Darkness.<sup>3</sup>

J. H. A. HART.

<sup>1</sup> Eph. ii. 17.

<sup>2</sup> Matt. iv. 14-16.

<sup>3</sup> Eph. vi. 12 (N.B. references to *panoply* in context).



## *PISIDIAN ANTIOCH.*

THE history of Pisidian Antioch falls into three periods: first, the early Hellenistic city from 300 to 25 B.C. ; secondly, the Roman Colonia Antiocheia during the first two or two and a half centuries after the Province Galatia and the Colonia were instituted ; thirdly, the re-Hellenized metropolis Antioch, after Roman language and custom died out and the Graeco-Oriental spirit revived probably somewhere about or soon after A.D. 212. Some would add an earlier period and the history of a pre-Hellenic and Phrygian town ; but this depends on a doubtful interpretation of Strabo's description of Antioch, which we cannot accept. There was a Phrygian population around, and an important hieron of the Phrygian religion in the neighbourhood ; but there is no reason to think that a city existed on the site before the Seleucid foundation about 300-290 B.C.

In Antioch we shall find elements of population similar to those which we have been observing in Tarsus, chiefly Anatolian, Greek and Jewish ; but, owing to difference in the proportion of the elements and in the general circumstances, there is a marked difference in the character of life and spirit in the two cities.

### I. THE CITY AND ITS FOUNDATION.

The situation of Antioch is very fine, but the locality is now deserted, forlorn and devoid of ruins that possess any interest or beauty. The city occupied a low plateau, varying from 50 to 200 feet above the plain that lies in front. The surface of the plateau has been so much transformed by the needs and works of life in a great city, the cutting down of hills, the doing away with slopes that were too steep, the filling up of hollows, the scarping of the outer

edge to strengthen the defences—which always take place on a site long inhabited by a civilized and ingenious population, partly from plans of city improvement, partly from natural and inevitable action,—that in wandering over the site of Antioch in 1905 the writer was unable to form any conception of its original form before the transforming hand of man was applied to it. It lies about 3,600 to 3,800 ft. above the sea-level.

In shape the plateau of the city approximates to a rectangle. On the east (one of the long sides) it is bounded by the deep, narrow, slightly curving glen of the river Anthios, which has chosen to cut its way from the north towards south between this outlying plateau and the higher hills that rise sharp from its opposite bank.<sup>1</sup> The long glen of the Anthios is very picturesque, and in time of flood must present an impressive spectacle, when the waters rise high and fill the bottom of the narrow glen, far down below the level of the plateau (which seems to be highest at the edge of the glen). The plateau must be nearly two miles in circumference, and as it presents a fairly steep outer face, even where it is lowest, it must have been an imposing fortress when high strong walls crowned the outer face on all sides.

The strength of the fortress was needed to withstand attack from the Pisidian mountaineers, an unruly and dangerous race. Antioch was calculated to present an almost impregnable front to such raids and sudden attacks as enemies of that type were likely to make. The ordinary water supply was by an aqueduct which conducts the water from a distance of several miles away in the Sultan-Dagh, partly by an underground conduit, but for the last mile above ground.<sup>2</sup> It would, of course, be easy in case

<sup>1</sup> See the description by G. Weber, quoted in the following note.

<sup>2</sup> It is described with illustrations by G. Weber in *Arch. Jahrb.* 1904, p. 96 f.

of war for besiegers to cut the aqueduct, and divert the flow; but this would not cause more than great inconvenience to the besieged city. The river Anthios flows for a long distance close under the city wall, and it would hardly be possible for besiegers to prevent the garrison from obtaining water out of the river in sufficient quantity for the necessities of life. The built aqueduct begins to appear above the ground one mile from the city, and gradually becomes higher, and is borne on arches.

The modern town of Yalowatch is also situated on the Anthios, a little lower down and on both sides of the stream. It is a widely scattered town, divided into twelve separate quarters (called *Mahale* in Turkish). Professor Sterrett suggests very ingeniously<sup>1</sup> that these correspond to twelve divisions or vici in the Roman city; and this may be regarded as highly probable in view of the permanence of ancient religious facts; now the political division in ancient times had always a religious foundation. This modern town extends nearly up to the edge of the ancient site, but from the middle of the modern town to the centre of the ancient site the distance must be quite a mile and a half.

Beyond doubt the ancient population of Antioch lived a good deal in the open country. The land is pleasant, part of it is rich and fertile, part contains high-lying pastures, and the territory stretches from the lofty range of Sultan-Dagh on the north-east away down in the direction of the great double lake called Limnai about fifteen miles or more to the south-west. It is, however, not probable that Antiochian territory reached so far as the Limnai. The lake shore seems to have been occupied with villages, scattered over the great Imperial estates which will be described in a later Section. Those estates had originally

<sup>1</sup> *Epigraphic Journey in Asia Minor*, p. 143.

been the property of the god, and Antiochian territory had been part of the estates until one of the Seleucid kings gave part of the god's land to the garrison city which he founded on this magnificent site.

Nothing is recorded about the date and circumstances of the foundation; but there can be little doubt that the city owed its origin to the first of the Seleucid kings, Seleucus Nikator, and its name to his father, Antiochus, the deified head of the royal family.

An inscription<sup>1</sup> shows that the worship of Seleucus Nikator was established in the valley of Apollonia (which opens up west from the Limnai), and, as this cult lasted into the Roman period, it must have been founded on a considerable scale with an assured revenue. This establishment proves that Seleucus took an active interest in the important route which runs from Apameia through the valley of Apollonia by Antioch to Syria. On this road the critical point is Antioch, where the road turns round the Limnai, and a sovereign who was strengthening his hold on the road could not miss this point, unless he chose some other place in the neighbourhood. The water supply determined the exact site chosen; other defensive points could easily be found, but they were all set aside by their weakness in respect of water during a siege.

The foundations made by the first Seleucus were intended to be a means of establishing and glorifying the whole family and not merely his single self. They were certainly laid out on a comprehensive plan to bind together the whole Empire, and they were to be dynastic not personal monuments. Hence the later Seleucid rule, that the city bore the name of the king who founded it,<sup>2</sup> does not apply

<sup>1</sup> Sterrett, *Wolfe Expedition*, p. 402; see *Studies in the History and Art of the Eastern Provinces* (1906), p. 360.

<sup>2</sup> See EXPOSITOR, 1906, May, p. 465.



to the cities of Seleucus Nikator. Some he called after himself, but the most important bore the name of his father Antiochus as the head and guardian genius of the family; one at least on this same road took its title from Apollo<sup>1</sup> as the patron god of the dynasty (the successive kings were considered as manifestations of Apollo in human form on the earth), others of his mother Laodice and his wife Apama. The inclusion of the latter was significant, for it was she, an Asiatic, who conveyed the right of succession in Asia to her husband.<sup>2</sup>

Antioch was thus surrounded by a sea of purely Phrygian population and custom. The case was, of course, similar in regard to all Seleucid garrison cities: they were founded to be strongholds of the royal power, of a more Greek type, though far from purely Greek, amid Asiatic peoples. But it remained characteristic of the Pisidian Antioch that it continued to be the one centre of the Seleucid form of civilization for a very large territory, as well as a bulwark against the whole strength of the Pisidian mountain tribes, while the land around continued to be mainly Anatolian and Phrygian in manners and religion, hardly affected even in the most superficial way by Hellenic influence (as will be shown in a later Section). This situation, by isolating the Seleucid colonists in Antioch so thoroughly, must have made them even more vividly conscious than the colonists in other Seleucid garrison-cities were of their dependence on the support of the kings and of the Seleucid capital Antioch in Syria, more opposed to their ever-present enemy the Phrygian and Pisidian barbarian, and more devoted supporters of the mixed type of civilization which they represented. The evidence, scanty as it is, points in this direction.

<sup>1</sup> Apollonia, see *Studies in the History of the Eastern Provinces* (1906), p. 360 (against the opinion of G. Hirschfeld, who regarded this city as a Pergamenian foundation).

<sup>2</sup> *Pauline, and Other Studies*, pp. 169, 187.

We have spoken of Pisidian Antioch as surrounded by Phrygians and bordering on the Pisidian land. Such are the topographical facts, and such are the accounts given by the ancients, Strabo, Ptolemy, etc. In an inscription of the city it is called "Mygdonian," from the old Phrygian chief or king Mygdon.

Thee, Dionysios, here (in marble), the city Mygdonian Antioch has [placed in honour] and (engraved) the garland of peace (on the basis).

The ornament of a garland, symbolical of the peace which Dionysios (a soldier acting as chief of police for the Region round Antioch) had produced by his good service, was placed on the basis which supported the statue of Aurelius Dionysios, Regionary Centurion. The text belongs to the third century, and is in Greek, though dedicated to an officer of the Roman service. By that time Roman Antioch had reverted to the former condition of a Hellenic city, and even the official documents had come to be expressed in Greek, whereas during the first and second centuries Latin was (as we shall see below) the language not only of official documents but also to a large extent of private inscriptions.

In another inscription the city is said to be in Phrygia.<sup>1</sup> Not until the Province Pisidia was formed about A.D. 295, was Pisidian Antioch in any strict sense a city of Pisidia. Under the Romans it was geographically a city of Phrygia, politically a city of the Province Galatia.

It is our first task to determine to what race belonged these Seleucid colonists of Antioch. It was they who determined the character of the city.

## II. THE JEWS IN PISIDIAN ANTIOCH.

In the other Pauline cities the presence of Jewish inhabitants is either proved by the authority of the Acts

<sup>1</sup> The inscription is quoted below in Section III.

alone (as at Derbe and Lystra), or confirmed by clear evidence from other sources, but their status and rights in the city are either unknown or demonstrated only by indirect arguments. Even at Tarsus, where the evidence is most complete, the proof that there was a body of Jews, possessing the full rights of citizens and burgesses, results from a series of concurrent arguments, all pointing towards the same conclusion ; but no record of any family of Jewish citizens remains, except the family of Paul himself. The deficiency in this last respect may seem serious only to those who are on the outlook for opportunity to throw discredit on the trustworthiness of Acts ; but, as a matter of fact, epigraphy rarely records such matters, and moreover hardly any Tarsian inscriptions have been preserved. In Iconium, Lystra and Derbe it remains uncertain whether the Jewish population had the status of resident aliens or of citizens ; the former being more probable in Lystra, the latter in Iconium, while Derbe is wrapped in complete obscurity by absolute lack of evidence.

In the case of Antioch alone complete evidence has survived, and that in a curiously accidental way. The fact of citizenship is not often formally recorded in the epitaphs of any city, and, when it is recorded, there is usually some special reason<sup>1</sup> ; moreover, Jews can rarely be traced in the epigraphy of such cities, because the men usually adopted Greek or Roman names, and thus have become undistinguishable. The inscriptions of Antioch are wholly taken up with matters of other kinds, and in none of them can any Jew be identified with certainty ; but an epitaph of Apollonia reveals a Jewess of Antioch by her name, Debbora. It belongs to the late second or the third century after Christ.

<sup>1</sup> As when, for example, in a Eumenian inscription on a grave a certain Hermes is styled "Akmonian and Eumenian," *Cities and Bish. of Phr.*, ii. p. 389, C.I.G. 3893.

An Antiochian [by race], sprung from ancestors who held many offices of state in the fatherland, by name Debbôra, given in marriage to a famous man Pamphylus, [I am buried here,] receiving this monument as a return of gratitude from him for my virgin marriage.<sup>1</sup>

The evidence given in this brief inscription is singularly complete. Debbora was an Antiochian citizen by race, but was married to Pamphylus of Apollonia.

That Debbora was a Jewess seemed placed beyond reach of doubt by her name. The spelling is that of the Septuagint, whereas the spelling Deborah in the English Version is taken from the Hebrew text.

The first two words of the epitaph illustrate the technical usage which was discussed in the *EXPOSITOR*, December, 1906, pp. 506, 507.<sup>2</sup> Debbora, an Antiochian citizen by descent, did not reside in Antioch, and the formula is therefore used which indicates the real citizenship of a person who resided in an alien city. In her case situation may possibly have been complicated by an additional fact; Pamphylus, her husband, may have perhaps been a citizen of Apollonia; and if that were so, the question of the right of intermarriage between citizens of the two cities would come up. This is a most difficult subject, and information fails us. If there were such right of intermarriage, Debbora would take the citizenship of her husband, and cease to be an Antiochian. But it is quite uncertain whether Pamphylus (whom we may suppose to have been a Jew,<sup>3</sup> probably) was a citizen of Apollonia: he may have been only

<sup>1</sup> M. Chamonard's copy in *Bull. Corr. Hellen.* 1893, p. 257, is more complete than Professor J. R. S. Sterrett's.

Ἀντιόχισσα [γένος] πατρὸς γονέων πολυτείμων  
 ὄνομα Δεββωρά, ἀνδρὶ δοθεῖσα κλύτῳ  
 Παμφύλῳ . . . [φι]λοτ[έ]κνω . . . ιητ . . . Εὐμήλ . .  
 παρθενικῶν λέκτρων ἀντιλαβοῦσα χάριν.

<sup>2</sup> The restoration γένος in the first line is convincing and almost certain.

<sup>3</sup> Marriage between a Jewess and a Hellene was certainly rare, though it sometimes happened, Acts xvi. 1.



a resident alien. It is also uncertain how far Roman custom or law interfered to permit intermarriage between different cities of the same province ; but after 212 A.D., when all citizens of provincial cities became Roman citizens, intermarriage certainly must have been legal. The epitaph of Debbora, however, cannot be later than 212.

From whatever cause it resulted, the fact seems clear that Debbora did not become a citizen of Apollonia, but remained a resident alien, "Antiochian by race." The expression which occurs in the Eumenian inscription quoted in the footnote on a previous page, suggests that there was a special formula which would have been used to express the status of an Antiochian who settled in Apollonia and acquired citizenship there.

The most significant words in the epitaph are the two which describe Debbora's ancestors as "having held many honours of the fatherland" (πολυτείμους πατρός). The term "honours" (τιμαί, *honores*) was regularly applied to the higher magistracies in self-governing cities. The word which we have rendered "ancestors" (γονεῖς) is used ordinarily in prose epitaphs in the sense of "parents"; but here in the language of verse it designates the male ancestors, who entered on the career of office (*cursus honorum*), and it looks back on a line of such ancestors for generations. The epitaph of Debbora may belong to the first or second century after Christ, more probably the first.

The inscription just mentioned is the only certain indication of a Jewish colony in Antioch ; and it is fortunate that its evidence is so complete and far-reaching. It shows that for generations Jews of one family had been citizens of Antioch and had attained high offices. Elsewhere the proof has been pointed out that the existence of one single and solitary Jewish citizen in a Greek city was impossible<sup>1</sup> :

<sup>1</sup> *Letters to the Seven Churches*, p. 149.

there must have been a separate class or "Tribe" of Jewish citizens in order to make it possible for any Jew to be a citizen. Such a "Tribe," bearing some Greek title, formed the means through which Jews could be members of this Hellenic city (for the early Antioch was Hellenic, a centre of Hellenism as adapted by Seleucid policy to Oriental conditions); it was by making the Jewish religion into the religious bond of their own "Tribe" that the Jews could enter Greek city life and hold offices of State.

The Jew who was a magistrate in any Greek city must have been willing to shut his eyes to a good deal, tacitly to permit a great deal of idolatrous ritual which was performed at every meeting for political or social purposes under his presumed patronage. He must also have been ready and successful in the conduct of public affairs and in the art of wooing a constituency. In no other way was it possible to win votes and gain an election. The original Jewish colony had been for three centuries and a half exposed to the influence which such practices exert on the character of men, when Paul visited Antioch, and a profound effect must have been produced on a race naturally receptive and progressive. It was inevitable that the Jews of Antioch should become very different in character from the narrow class of Palestinian Jews; they were Hellenized, Greek-speaking, able to move freely and win success in the free competition of a Hellenic self-governing city. Yet that standing miracle always remains: they were still Jews in feeling and religion, citizens of the Hellenic city of Pisidian Antioch, yet men of Judaea, as the centuries passed. The religious teaching of the home and the synagogue held them firmly in the national character.

It may seem strange that no memorial of the Jews at Antioch should have been found among the considerable number of Antiochian inscriptions, and that the accident

of a Jewish woman residing at Apollonia should furnish the only proof that Jews were citizens at Antioch. But the same dearth of information exists about the Jewish colonies in Phrygia and Lydia : only the rarest and scantiest references exist in epigraphy to those large and important bodies of people.

Elsewhere it has been suggested <sup>1</sup> that a certain P. Anicius Maximus, commander of the army in Egypt under Claudius, to whom in his native city of Antioch an inscription of honour was raised by the citizens of Alexandria, may have been a Jew ; and that the influence of the large body of Jewish citizens in Alexandria may have been the originating cause of this action in the remote Phrygian city. Anicius Maximus served as an officer of the Second Legion Augusta in Britain, A.D. 44, and was decorated for his conduct there. He then was promoted to the command in Egypt ; and it was perhaps about A.D. 50 or soon after that the dedication in his honour was ordered by the great city of Alexandria. The inscription was engraved on a basis, which may have supported a small statue. But without further evidence this suggestion must remain a mere empty hypothesis.

### III. THE GREEK COLONISTS IN EARLY ANTIOCH.

It has been shown <sup>2</sup> that Jews and Greeks were the two educated races, to whom especially the Seleucid kings trusted as colonists and makers of a higher civilization in the Anatolian garrison cities. Strabo mentions that it was a colony from Magnesia on the Maeander, but gives no information as to the manner or date of the foundation. We must understand that in some circumstances otherwise unknown, Seleucus Nikator brought a body of Mag-

<sup>1</sup> I thought that the suggestion was made in the *Church in the Roman Empire before A.D. 170* ; but that is not the case. The inscription is published in the C.I.L. III., from my copy, and later by Professor Sterrett.

<sup>2</sup> *Letters to the Seven Churches*, p. 130.

nesians to people his new city. Strabo says nothing about any other class of inhabitants; and this would suggest that the Magnesians formed the bulk of the population, and that the city was really a new foundation, not a mere transformation of a previously existing city. Both these inferences are in agreement with all the rest of our vague and scanty information. Strabo would not be likely to have any information about a Jewish element in the city; for, as we have seen, that element was concealed under Greek forms and names, and the Greeks were never ready to acknowledge that Jews had any part in founding a Hellenic city. Only when complaining to some overlord against their Jewish fellow-citizens as not taking fair part in the life of the city,<sup>1</sup> do they seem ever to have admitted that Jews formed an element in a Hellenic city.

Strabo's evidence is entirely confirmed by the epitaph found in Rome of an Antiochian who had travelled to the great city of the Empire, and probably settled there:

A Magnesian of Phrygia (am I); and Appe, devoted as a virgin to the Scythian goddess (Artemis Tauropolos), nursed me in the olive-clad Anthian plain.<sup>2</sup>

That "Magnesian of Phrygia" should be a poetic equivalent of "Antiochian" is in exact agreement with Strabo. In both authorities all thought of a native Phrygian or a Jewish element in the population of the city is lost.

#### IV. THE PHRYGIANS OF ANTIOCH.

That in the Seleucid garrison cities generally there was a native element in the population may be taken as practically

<sup>1</sup> *Letters to the Seven Churches*, p. 152.

<sup>2</sup> Kaibel, *Epigr. Graec. Ital. etc.*, no. 933, published this inscription very incorrectly in respect of transcription. Aipe is the name in the copy, for which Kaibel suggests ἀννί. He misunderstands the phrase, "a Scythian virgin," the meaning of which is given above: on the term "virgin" see *Pauline and Other Studies*, p. 108; *Histor. Comm. on Galatians*, 40, 202; *Church in the Rom. Empire before 170*, p. 397 f.



certain. A city peopled purely by foreigners might have been efficient as a military stronghold, but could never have been serviceable in the other purpose for which those colonies were intended, viz. in acting as civilizing centres from which the type of manners and education favoured by the Seleucid policy might spread over the surrounding land and people. The native element in the cities acted as an intermediary between the foreign colonists and the surrounding natives; the Phrygian citizens shared in the rights and in the education of the colonists, while blood and feeling and language united them with the surrounding population. At Antioch, whether it be that the proportion of colonists to natives was unusually large, or that the early date of foundation and other causes had resulted in thorough Hellenization of the native element in the city by the colonists, or that certain influences had kept the surrounding population from being affected by the Graeco-Asiatic education of the city, there seems to have been a very distinct separation and contrast between the urban and the rustic people. Probably all three reasons contributed to produce this result. Here we have not the usual state of relations which elsewhere existed between country and Seleucid city; there is not such a simple uniform progress as is usual in Seleucid States, where the rustics either were utterly uneducated and ignorant, or were gradually acquiring an interest and share in the civilization of the city as education gradually spread from the centre of population. There is apparent, especially on the north-west and west of Antioch, a totally different kind of custom and society; and there was a broad and growing gap between the Hellenic city, Antioch, and the population of the country district around.

The evidence, then, scanty as it is, points to the conclusion that the Hellenistic Antioch was rather a Greek

colony than a Phrygian city Hellenized. The Greek colonists predominated ; and, although a Phrygian element in the city must be supposed, yet either it was not so numerous as to affect the character of the city, or it was so thoroughly Hellenized as to acquiesce wholly in the Hellenic spirit. Now we observe that Apollonia, the neighbouring city, which we take to be a companion foundation made by Seleucus Nikator, retained something of the same character throughout the Roman period. It was never Romanized by Italian colonists, as Antioch was ; and hence its inscriptions of the Roman time show us the character of the Hellenistic Apollonia, whereas the inscriptions of Antioch in the Roman time show a Romanized and Latin Antioch. Now Apollonia regularly styled itself a "colonial" city, as no other Seleucid foundation does. Its inhabitants boasted on coins and inscriptions that they were entirely strangers and colonists: "the Apolloniatai (who are) Lycian and Thracian colonists."<sup>1</sup> We are warranted in assuming, on the authority of Strabo, that the people of Hellenistic Antioch had the same feeling.

#### V. ANTIOCH A CITY OF GALATIA.

That Pisidian Antioch was a part of the Roman Province Galatia in the first century needs now no proof, since Professor E. Schürer, the warmest and most distinguished opponent of this view, has withdrawn his opposition. The only doubt that remained was as to the date when this connexion ceased. A large part of south-western Galatia was taken from it and incorporated in the new Province of Lycia-Pamphylia in A.D. 74. Another large slice of south-eastern Galatia, including the cities of Derbe and Isaura,

<sup>1</sup> The title *Ἀπολλωνιατῶν Λυκίων καὶ Θρακῶν Κολόνων* is often mistranslated as if three classes of people were meant. The people of Synnada and other cities called themselves "Synnadeis Dorians," and so on, without adding "Colonists"; this means "by origin Dorians."

was transferred to the new Province called the Three Eparchies (Cilicia-Lycaonia-Isauria) somewhere about 138 A.D. After deducting these parts, there remained a narrow strip of territory running along the west and north and east coasts of the Limnai, and the north and east and south coasts of Lake Karalis (Bey-Sheher-Giol), with regard to which evidence was defective. On the one hand this territory was almost completely separated from the main part of Galatia by a great wedge of the Province Asia which intervened. Especially the extreme western part of the territory, including Antioch and Apollonia, a long and narrow strip of land, almost entirely surrounded by the two Provinces Asia and Pamphylia, seemed singularly unsuited to be a part of the Province Galatia. Moreover Ptolemy mentions Antioch as a city of the district Pisidia in the Province Pamphylia.

On the other hand, Ptolemy<sup>1</sup> mentions both Apollonia and Pisidian Antioch as cities of the Province Galatia, and this fuller statement outweighs his other mention of Antioch in Pamphylia, suggesting that the latter is erroneous. Moreover, these cities must either have been left to Galatia or transferred to Pamphylia or to Asia: now they were not assigned to Pamphylia, for epigraphic proof is abundant at Antioch that the city belonged to Galatia long after the enlargement and reorganization of Pamphylia in A.D. 74; and there is not the slightest reason to think that Antioch could ever have been given to Asia. Finally, the lost *Acta* of the martyrs Alpius and others seem to have showed that Antioch was still part of Galatia in the time of Diocletian (*Acta Sanctorum*, 28 Sept., p. 563), and the brief quotation from the *Acta* in the *Menologium Sirletianum* seems probably trustworthy.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Geog.* v.

<sup>2</sup> *Histor. Comm. on Galatians*, p. 209 f.

On these grounds I ranked Antioch as a Galatian city (and with it Apollonia, which must be classed with it), throughout the second and third centuries, in *Historical Commentary on Galatians*, pp. 177 f., 209 f., though quite acknowledging that a certain doubt might still be felt. All doubt, however, was removed by the discovery in 1905 of a group of milestones eight miles west of Apollonia on the great road, Antioch-Apollonia-Apameia-Ephesus, described above; one of them contains the name of the provincial Governor, Atticius Strabo, who is known to have governed Galatia in A.D. 198, and to have renovated the roads of that Province. It is therefore now certain that the Region of Antioch belonged to Galatia throughout the first and second centuries, and there seems no possibility that any change in organization of the Province can have occurred between 198 and 295. About the latter year Diocletian broke up the Province Galatia; he took South Galatia, including Iconium, enlarged it by adding parts of Asia and Pamphylia, and constituted it as the Province Pisidia.

W. M. RAMSAY.



NOTES ON RECENT NEW TESTAMENT STUDY.

THE detailed analysis of the Gospels has received an acute contribution from Dr. Emil Wendling, whose *Ur-Marcus. Versuch einer Wiederherstellung der ältesten Mitteilungen über das Leben Jesus* (Tübingen, 1905) is a much-needed rehabilitation of the theory that our canonical Mark is not the original Mark, though the author's subtlety of division leads him often to results which seem unjustified by the internal evidence. The cardinal criterion by which the two strata of the Gospel are differentiated is that in the earlier form Jesus appears as a highly gifted teacher, whose life and sayings are briefly recorded; whereas the second and later stage represents Him as a worker of miracles. In addition to these, Dr. Wendling postulates a redactor, whose functions are editorial.

The Egyptian element in the eschatological world of the book of Revelation has more than once been discussed by archaeologists, and in the April number of the *Monist* (pp. 179-200) Miss Alice Grenfell illustrates afresh the Johannine imagery from the papyri and monuments of the Nile valley; e.g., the hair *white as wool* of i. 14 from the similar traits of Ani after his beatification and from Queen Thiti. The Egyptian analogies to *the second death* (pp. 182-3) are mostly to be sought on tombs or coffins, which have been occasionally found with the inscription: "Thou dost not die the second death," i.e. be annihilated. The sea of glass before the throne (Rev. iv. 6) suggests the water under the throne of Osiris (in the Book of the Dead), while the *four beasts* of iv. 6 have long been compared to the four funerary genii near the divine throne of Egypt, also semi-animal in form (pp. 184 f.). These four genii,

besides their connexion with the fortunes of the departed, represented the four points of the compass (cf. Rev. vii. 1, pp. 192 f.). Among other parallels noted by the writer is that of the sixth stanza of the Hymn to the Nile ("Thou driest the tear of every eye") with Revelation vii. 17 (Isa. xxv. 8); also, "in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, there are two scarabs of lions with serpent-headed tails" (cf. Rev. ix. 19: *the heads of the horses were as the heads of lions: . . . their tails were like unto serpents*).

The question of the Imperial cultus, so vital to the criticism of the Apocalypse of John, has recently been touched on two sides. Dr. Edward Meyer, in the *Historische Zeitschrift* (1903), p. 398, has called attention to the influence upon such a practice exerted by Aristotle's idealizing sketch of the godlike perfect being, whose virtues hover on the borderland of the human and the divine. Herr Adolf Matthaei, in the *Preussische Jahrbücher* (1905), cxxii. pp. 402-79, calls attention to more concrete and immediate traces of the rise of the cultus in the Eastern provinces. In the island of Thera, for example, which lies not far from Patmos, an inscription has lately been deciphered, in which a certain Artemidorus boasts of having erected altars and a sanctuary to the first three Ptolemies, and many other evidences of the widespread instinct for the canonization or deification of monarchs are to be found previous to the opening period of the Roman Empire, when the Caesars took over the habit for the sake of policy, and when, even as early as 27 B.C. in an island like Thera itself,<sup>1</sup> a pagan altar could be inscribed "to the almighty Caesar, the son of God." Here Matthaei discusses the problem of how far the various emperors were to blame for conniving at the practice.

<sup>1</sup> See Adolf Bauer's description of Thera in the same journal (1900, c. pp. 281-295).

Domitian, he rightly judges, was deliberate in the matter. This emperor, under and against whose régime the Apocalypse of John was composed, not only permitted, but encouraged and enforced the payment of divine honours to himself as "Dominus ac Deus." As for the religious element or value of this cult, while the worship of the dead emperors naturally sprang often from quite naïve gratitude on the part of the common people, the cult of the living emperor is pronounced by the writer to have been less sincere and admirable. Yet, bound up as it often was with hypocrisy and servility, a modern historian will not judge it as harshly as did the prophet John or the early Christian apologists. In its better phase, it denoted a blend of patriotism and religion, and worked for the unifying of the wide empire under its divinely appointed head.

In discussing the thirteenth chapter of the Johannine Apocalypse (pp. 477 f.), the writer takes the first beast with the crowns and horns to represent the Imperial cultus, whilst the second symbolizes the provincial authorities whose function and joy it was to promote the interests of the cult in the temples and assemblies of the provinces, especially throughout Asia Minor.

In his address on the study of the *κοινή*, delivered at the Hamburg Conference of Philologists, which has been reprinted in the *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Alterthum* (1906, 246-263), Professor Albert Thumb reverts to the vexed question of Hebraisms in New Testament Greek, and protests eagerly against the practice of finding a Semitic or Aramaic background behind phrases like *σὺ τίς εἶ, ποῦ ἐστὶν ἐκεῖνος, καὶ λέγει τὶ κλαίεις* in the Fourth Gospel, as though such could only have been written by a Palestinian Jew. The sense of a term like *יְהוָה* is totally different from *εὐθέως*, and Harnack is rebuked for detecting a Semitic

colouring in the logion of Acts xx. 35. Heitmüller is welcomed to the ranks of the anti-Hebraists for showing that even the formula εἰς (τὸ) ὄνομα was current in various senses throughout Hellenistic Greek, and that the distinctively Jewish ἐν (τῷ) ὀνόματι is not absolutely at variance with the spirit of the Greek language. Special mention is also made of Dr. J. H. Moulton's work on New Testament Greek. In fact, "as almost every day may throw some fresh light on so-called 'Semitisms,' it is wholly erroneous, in the present state of research, to build any literary or theological hypotheses whatsoever on forms of speech which appear to be Semitisms."

Dealing with questions of grammar, Professor Thumb affirms that ἀπέχουσι in Matthew vi. 2, 5, 16 is equivalent to ἔλαβον or ἔσχον, i.e. it is an aoristic present, according to the analogies of Greek usage (cf. Erman's proofs from the papyri in *Archiv für Papyrusforsch.* i. 77 f.). Again, the Asiatic home of the Fourth Gospel is more than suggested by the fact that (p. 259) the preference of the author for ἐμός, instead of ἐμοῦ and σοῦ, agrees with the survival, in the Pontic and Cappadocian dialect alone, of the possessive adjectives, the other non-Greek dialects retaining the forms μοῦ etc., while the infinitive of purpose, which is prominent in the New Testament, also lingers in the Pontic dialect.

Two incidental protests against this dominant tendency, represented by Deissmann and Moulton, to eliminate Hebraisms as far as possible from Biblical Greek, are voiced by Dr. Nestle and Professor Swete. The former, in Preuschen's *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* (1906, 279-280), points to an expression like ὁμολογεῖν ἐν τινι (Matt. x. 32, Luke xii. 8) as a "Syrism." He agrees with Zahn that this cannot be explained apart from the influence of Semitic idiom. Similarly, Dr. Swete, in his new commentary on the Apocalypse (p. cxx.), devotes a



footnote to deprecating the somewhat hasty induction "that the Greek of the New Testament has been but slightly influenced by the familiarity of the writers with Hebrew and Aramaic. . . . It remains to be considered how far the quasi-Semitic colloquialisms of the papyri are themselves due to the influence of the large Greek-speaking Jewish population of the Delta."

The recent article by Professor Baljon, which was noticed in these columns (June, pp. 561 f.), has confirmed Messrs. J. C. B. Mohr of Tübingen in their resolve to issue a new and elaborate commentary on the New Testament, entitled a *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*, which will introduce readers to the results of historical and linguistic criticisms as these affect the religious interpretation of the New Testament scriptures. One part of this commentary has already appeared, viz. an edition of Romans by Dr. Hans Lietzmann, the general editor of the series. To this I hope to return later. Meantime, the prospectus of the work may be noticed, especially some pages by F. Niebergall, the well-known Heidelberg writer, upon the practical exposition of the New Testament. Niebergall's problem is that of Baljon. He faces the ordinary dilemma: either Scripture is the Word of God, or it is false. Formerly, a mediating phrase was found in, "Scripture is not God's Word, but contains God's Word." Now, the favourite statement is, "Scripture is the record (*die Urkunde*) or original document of the divine revelation." Commenting on this somewhat enigmatic sentence, Niebergall points out that "revelation," on the lips of a man, presupposes faith. "As religious people, we call any object or fact a means of God's revelation, when we connect therewith the God whom we possess within ourselves—a proceeding which (I put what follows in a relative clause, in order to avoid any miscon-

ception of my main statement), which naturally does not exclude the other, i.e. the religious conception and use of 'revelation,' under corresponding conditions." Revelation is not some objective magnitude, which is the same to all and sundry. It exists as such primarily for those who view the scriptures subjectively under the category of "God saith."

Taken apart from this subjective presupposition and interpretation, the Scriptures show various stages of an evolution in the religious ideas and practices of the peoples whom they describe, and "for a really historical understanding of Scripture the most vital thing is a clear conviction that it is composed of precipitates from the spiritual activity of persons who sought to exercise an influence, in the moral and religious sense of the term, upon their various ages. In this all are at one. Only, they differ in the object, the means, and the presuppositions of their work." Historical criticism seeks to differentiate the various ideals of the life which was acceptable to God. It seeks to understand the environment of each attempt to realize the ideal, and to unfold the convictions of faith which served to promote that realization. "Instead of the Word which God once spoke to his people, we therefore get a rising series of testimonies, and indeed of personalities, who speak of God according to the ruling spirit of their respective ages and in their own way."

The same general problem is handled, from a similar standpoint, by Professor Otto Baumgarten in a brief introduction to the excellent and successful *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, which Professor Johannes Weiss is editing for the special benefit of those who desire to learn untechnically how the results of modern criticism work out in a commentary.

Baumgarten is convinced that the historical criticism of

the New Testament must be of signal service to the genuine interests of practical edification among Protestant Christians. But does not the former, it may be retorted, produce a chill feeling of distance? Scripture, to be used for devotional purposes, must be taken as a timeless word of God. Its eternal truths are independent of time and place. What then is the use of busying oneself about the remote historical origins and developments of Biblical ideas, especially as this tends to distract the mind from their living and permanent appeal?

Baumgarten's first answer is that, without historical criticism, it is impossible to arrive at a correct and definite idea of what is Biblical. Unless investigations are made into the rise and environment of the Scriptures, our notions of what is Scriptural become confused with slavery to the letter of the record; piety becomes the prey of literalism, and the doors are open for allegorizing, with all its attendant anarchy and looseness of thought. Historical criticism, whether higher or lower, here proves itself the true ally of practical religion. In relegating each passage to its original site and in reading one Scripture after another in the light of its contemporary situation, it "frees the living present from a slavish bondage to primitive Christianity." Only thus can the Bible, as Herder saw, become a popular book, a book for the people. Besides, the knowledge of such local conditions helps a sound and practical view of Scripture by showing that the writers did not speak of some ideal dream unconnected with the needs and experience of their own day. They addressed their present. And the one way to escape the rationalizing exegesis, which ignores the form and particular expression of Scripture as irrelevant, is to penetrate through that form and expression to the living religious forces which were temporarily but really enshrined therein. For the personal experience underlying these ex-

pressions is of abiding value. The truth of Scripture lies not in impersonal laws and principles, but in the phases of personal life and faith.

Furthermore, historical criticism delivers piety from erroneous ideas of the unity of Scripture, as if the latter were an iron-bound, rigid harmony. The differences of standpoint, visible in writers like Paul and James and John, correspond to varieties of personal feeling in our own day ; and historical exegesis explains how it is possible and even justifiable for one to be Johannine, another Pauline, in his outlook on Christianity.

Finally, there is the service done by historical criticism in giving a true representation of certain idiosyncrasies and traits, e.g. in a writer like Paul, which often are either literally construed to the detriment of Christianity, or generalized away by the dogmatic interest. Historical criticism explains these from the contemporary world of ideas and practices. It thus frees Christianity from what are supposed often to be hampering anachronisms. It enables a right judgment to be passed upon the faith, by disclosing the personal and historical channels along which it has flowed in early Christianity. "And in this way the real life of the Scripture ceases to give people the paralysing impression of being remote, unintelligible, and unreal ; whilst, on the other hand, we are prompted afresh to search the Scripture gladly and freely, that Scripture in which we believe our race to-day may still find its true life, inasmuch as it testifies of him whose very person contained the reality of God."

The August number of Preuschen's *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Zeitschrift* is largely given over to patristic studies, but there are two interesting minor contributions to the exegesis of the New Testament by Nestle and A.



Bischoff. The former (pp. 257-259) suggests that the choice of shepherds as recipients of the revelation of the Davidic messiah's birth (Luke ii. 8-20) must go back to some special phase of Jewish tradition. He finds this in *the tower of Eder* (or, *of the flock*) mentioned in Micah iv. 8, which Jerome already interpreted in a messianic sense as referring to the shepherds of Bethlehem. Thus Luke ii. 8 would be based on Micah iv. 8, just as Matthew ii. 6 is modelled on Micah v. 2. Bischoff again (pp. 274-279) re-opens the question, whether *the end of the Lord*, in James v. 11, does not refer to the death of Jesus. In view of passages like James ii. 1 and Matthew xxii. 44, he will not admit that the mere absence of the article precludes the reference of κύριος to Jesus. Besides, must not τέλος, in the light of James i. 4, 5, and Matthew x. 22, xxiv. 13, denote a climax of relief from mortal woes which is too definite and final to be explained by Job's relief from pain? Job lived a hundred and forty years after his so-called τέλος (Job xlii. 16). As for the objection that Job and Jesus would be thus set side by side as examples, Bischoff points to Hebrews xii. 2, 3 and xiii. 7. The plural ὑπομείναντας, he contends, suggests a plurality of examples. And finally, the conventional form of the text may not accurately represent the original argument of the writer. Either τὴν ὑπομονὴν . . . εἶδετε might be taken as a parenthesis (cf. Luke xi. 18, xx. 19, and Rom. i. 13), within brackets, or εἶδετε might be supposed to have a double connexion, first with the accusative and then with ὅτι. Failing either of these exegetical hypotheses, we might read: *Ye have heard of the patience of Job and the end of the Lord, and have seen, etc.* Bischoff does not refer to an article by Bois in the *Studien und Kritiken* (1886, pp. 365-366), where a similar view of the passage is also advocated, on the ground that ὅτι depends on μακαρίζομεν, τὴν ὑπομονὴν . . . εἶδετε being put in brackets.

JAMES MOFFATT.

## PROFESSOR HARNACK ON LUKE.

### II.

AFTER stating in a general way the position which Professor Harnack takes up in this remarkable book,<sup>1</sup> it is only fair to give some specimens in detail of the arguments on which he relies. As we are in almost entire agreement with the main position of his book, it will conduce to clearness to say that most of the quotations which will be made at the outset are of points which seem to show his method at its best. In the concluding pages some remarks will be made on the method of proof which is employed in the book. As before, in order to avoid the frequent repetition of the personal name, we shall refer to him as the Author.

The Author's argument and inferences about the passages in which the first personal pronoun "We" is used are stated most definitely on pp. 37 f. After minutely examining Acts xvi. 10-17, and observing the identity in words, construction, tone and thought with the style of the rest of the *Acts* and the Third Gospel, he argues that, if the writer of the *Acts* took this passage from a "Source," he has left nothing in it unchanged except the first personal pronoun: everything else he has recast into his own characteristic vocabulary, syntax and style. Such a procedure is simply inconceivable, and therefore there remains only the position that the writer of the whole book is himself the original composer of these "We"-Passages: he is the man whose

<sup>1</sup> See EXPOSITOR, Dec. 1906, pp. 481 ff.

personal presence in Troas and Philippi with Paul obliges him to speak as a witness of and sharer in the action.

It is possible, the Author argues on p. 38, to go one step further. The writer did not take this passage, xvi. 10-17, from his own old notebook or diary, and insert it in his history. When he wrote the history twenty to thirty years after the events, he could not possibly have retained in all respects exactly the same style as he used in his old notebook. This passage was written when the book of the Acts was written; it was composed as part of the whole work, though this does not preclude the view that he had notes written down at the time, with which he could refresh his memory. This argument is absolutely conclusive to every person that has the power of comprehending and appreciating style and literary art; unfortunately many of the so-called "Higher Critics" seem to have become devoid of any such comprehension through fixing persistently their attention on words and details.

Luke was not merely a witness, he took part in the action: "Straightway we sought to go forth into Macedonia, concluding that God had called us for to preach the Gospel unto them," and "we sat down and spake unto the women" (xvi. 10, 13): here the narrator makes himself one of the missionaries to Macedonia. He was not a mere companion, he was an enthusiastic missionary to that country; and on my view (though not on the Author's view) he continued to be specially devoted to that country, except in so far as the still higher personal devotion to Paul called him away.

The Author, on the contrary, is disposed to connect Luke with Ephesus, with Asia, and with Achaia (as has been stated above, *EXPOSITOR*, Dec. 1906, p. 496 f.). He finds a sufficient proof that Luke was not a Macedonian in Acts xxvii. 2—"we put to sea, Aristarchus, a Macedonian of

Thessalonica, being with us " (p. 31). I cannot see any force in this reasoning. On the same principle it might be argued that Luke was not an Asian (which the Author is inclined to believe that he was), because in xx. 4, 5, he speaks of "Asians, Tychicus and Trophimus," who "were waiting for us at Troas."

The remarkable passage, Acts xvi. 9, must detain our attention for a moment, while we apply to it a principle which the Author lays down on p. 11, though he does not apply it to xvi. 9, and would deny the inferences which we shall draw. He points out that, throughout the "We"-Passages, Luke distinguishes carefully between "We" and Paul: wherever it is reasonably possible in view of historic and literary truth, he emphasizes Paul and keeps the "We" modestly in the background.<sup>1</sup> Now observe in xvi. 10 how the "We" is put forward. The vision was seen by Paul alone, the message was given to Paul alone, "Come over into Macedonia and help us." Yet the narrative continues, "And when he had seen the vision, straightway we sought to go forth into Macedonia, concluding that God had called us for to preach the Gospel unto them." Without any apparent necessity, even without any apparent justification, the writer assumes that, because Paul has been called into Macedonia, Luke shares in the call. There is no other passage in which the "We" is forced in without obvious justification; and on the view stated in *St. Paul the Traveller*, pp. 200-3, there is a justification hidden beneath the surface in this case also, for Luke had taken a part in the vision, and was therefore forced to conclude that he as well as Paul was called to Macedonia. Several reasons (which need not be repeated here) are there stated, which point to the idea that the man of Macedonia, whom Paul saw in the vision and recognized at sight as a Mace-

<sup>1</sup> See EXPOSITOR, Dec. 1906 p. 492.



donian, was Luke; and these are confirmed by the observation now stated.

Every time I read this remarkable passage, xvi. 6-10, I am more and more struck with the intense personal feeling that lies under the words, the hurry and rush of the narrative, and the quiet satisfaction of the conclusion "God had called us." Luke is here introducing himself, in the moment when he played so important a part in determining the course of Paul's work. The large space which is given to the Macedonian work in the *Acts* is out of proportion to its importance, and can only be explained by Luke's strong personal interest in it.

The Author gives as an example of the style of the "We"-Passages a similar analysis of xxviii. 1-16, a specimen of continuous sea-narrative; his treatment cannot be shortened, but must be studied in full. Only one criticism has to be made on this excellent piece of investigation. It is strange that on p. 44 the Author quotes, as if there were any strength in it, Professor Blass's unjustifiable objection to, and conjectural alteration of, the reading *παρασήμφ Διοσκούροις*, "whose sign was the Twin Brothers," given by MSS. and all other editions in *Acts* xxviii. 11. Neither of them has observed that this dative absolute is the correct technical form, guaranteed by many examples in inscriptions. This has been pointed out, and some examples quoted in an article published long ago in the *EXPOSITOR*.<sup>1</sup> There is no detail in which the exact technical accuracy of Luke's expression is more clearly made out than this, and

<sup>1</sup> In *St. Paul the Trav.*, p. 346, it did not occur to me even to defend this common technical usage (dates by a consul's name, e.g., being always tacked on loosely by this absolute dative in Greek, ablative in Latin); the most perfect parallel occurs in a Latin inscription C.I.L. III. 3 (Smith, *Voyage, etc., of St. Paul*, p. 261), *gubernatore navis parasemo Isopharia*, "sailing-master of the ship whose sign was the Pharian Isis," where the Greek translation would be *παρασήμφ Ἴσοφαρία*.

yet Professor Blass would change it into a commonplace relative clause, ᾧ ἦν παράσημον Διοσκούρων.

The Author devotes considerable space to statistics about the occurrence of the same words in the "We"-Passages and in Luke generally, as contrasted with the rarity or total absence of many of those words in Matthew, Mark and John. It is impossible to abbreviate this argument : the reasoning must be taken as a whole, and seems conclusive, though opinion will always differ a good deal as to the value of such verbal arguments in proving identity of authorship. Personally, I have not as a rule much belief in such arguments, but it must be confessed that the statistics in this case are impressive.

The single sign of difference between the language of the "We"-Passages and the rest of Luke lies in the unusually large number of words in the former, which are used nowhere else by Luke. Words which an author uses only once and no more occur throughout the writings of Luke as well as in all the other books of the New Testament ; they are distributed in a fairly even way, and in proportion to the amount of the "We"-Passages there should be in them about thirty-eight words which occur nowhere else in the *Acts* and the Third Gospel ; whereas there actually occur 111 of that class. But this is due to the subject matter. Navigation and voyages play a large part in the "We"-Passages, because it was to a large extent on voyages that Luke accompanied Paul in the earlier years of their friendship ; and he was by nature interested as a Greek in seamanship. Three-fifths of the words which are peculiar to the "We"-Passages are technical terms relating to ships, parts of a ship, naval officers, sea-winds, management of a ship, and matters of navigation generally, and almost all of them are nouns, while the few verbs without exception denote

actions required in seamanship. Such words are forced on the writer by his subject ; and, as the Author rightly remarks, it is a striking fact that in spite of the novelty of subject in chapter xxvii, describing the shipwreck, the ordinary style and vocabulary of Luke are traceable with perfect clearness even in that long passage (p. 60).

It is, of course, acknowledged by practically all scholars that Luke employed written Sources. These written Sources he has modified and recast so that they assume much of his own style. Now, if any one still continues, in spite of the above-stated proofs from style and vocabulary, to urge that Luke found the "We"-Passages in a written Source, and took them over into his book, transforming them into his own style and language, the Author replies by a careful study of the way in which Luke elsewhere uses his written Sources, from which he demonstrates that in spite of the freedom with which Luke handled and touched up his written Source, the original style, syntax and vocabulary still are clearly traceable in the transformed narrative. This is one of the most important and striking parts in the Author's work, and will reward the closest attention.

While every one admits freely as a starting point that Luke had access to written narratives about many events of which he had not been an eye-witness—for he himself mentions in the opening of his Gospel that there were many such written Sources, founded on information given by eye-witnesses, to which he could have recourse—there is not much agreement as to the extent to which, and the parts of his two books in which, he was indebted to these Sources. But there is at any rate one Source, the character of which is indubitable : for we possess the Source in practically its original form (or a form so near the original as to be equally useful for the immediate purpose of this investigation), and can thus tell exactly how far and in what way

Luke used it. Some Sources are more or less a matter of conjecture and inference, as they are lost in the original form and are merely supposed as the foundation of Luke's narrative. But it is practically universally admitted now that Luke employed the Second Gospel: he took a copy of Mark in much the same text and extent as we now possess, and he wrote out three-fourths of it in his own Gospel in much the same order as Mark wrote it. He improved the Greek, he touched it up with explanatory additions and "improvements" or "corrections," and he added greatly to it from other sources of information, oral or written; but the style, syntax and vocabulary of Mark are clearly discernible in the borrowed passages.

The Author exemplifies this in two passages, Mark i. 21-28 (i.e. Luke iv. 30-37) and Mark ii. 1-11 (i.e. Luke v. 17-24). A few verses may be quoted from the first as a specimen of this most luminous and instructive investigation, which ought to be studied by every one in the Author's own words.

Mark i. 21. And they go into Capernaum, and straightway on the Sabbath day he entered into the synagogue and taught.

Luke iv. 31. And he came down to Capernaum, a city of Galilee, and he was teaching them on the Sabbath day.

Mark has used the plural "they went after him" in the previous verse, and continues his narrative accordingly. But Luke had the singular in iv. 30 (which belongs to a passage derived from a non-Markan source), "he passing through the midst of them went his way"; and was therefore obliged to change Mark's plural to the singular. Further, in the preceding verses Mark's scene was the shore of the Sea of Galilee, and therefore the simple verb "go" was suitable. But Luke's scene in the preceding passage was at Nazareth, and he marks the change of scene from the hill-country of Nazareth to the lower coast of the lake,



“he came down.” And, as the readers for whom he wrote did not know the topography of Palestine, he adds to the name Capernaum the explanation “a city of Galilee.”<sup>1</sup> Again, Mark was fond of the word “straightway,” and often employed it (as in verse 23); but Luke disliked the usage, and often omits the word. Mark allowed the verb “teach” without an object; but this also was not a usage that Luke approved, and he inserted “them” (not very lucidly). The process “was teaching” seemed to Luke to express the facts better than the simple “taught.” He found the expression “was teaching” in the following sentence of Mark, and brought it over to this place.

22. And they were astonished at his teaching; for he was teaching them as having authority and not as the scribes.<sup>2</sup>

32. And they were astonished at his teaching, for his word was with authority.

In the second half of the verse, the thought is entirely remodelled and transformed into Lukan Greek and Lukan language; the verb had been transferred to the preceding sentence, and change was therefore imperatively required.

23. And straightway there was in their synagogue a man in an unclean spirit; and he cried out, saying—

33. And in the synagogue there was a man which had a spirit of an unclean demon, and he cried out with a loud voice—

Luke here cuts out the not very lucid “their,” and replaces the preposition “in” (perhaps a literal rendering by Mark from the original Semitic, not very satisfactory in Greek) by “which had”; he defines “unclean” more precisely; he substitutes the more vivid “with a loud

<sup>1</sup> Luke has already mentioned Capernaum in iv. 23; but there it occurs incidentally in a speech of Jesus, and explanation is unnecessary and would be out of place. Here the topographical explanation is useful and suitable.

<sup>2</sup> The quotations here follow the Authorized Version almost exactly, but occasional slight changes are made to follow the Greek more literally, as here “was teaching,” where both Authorized and Revised Versions give “taught” (which is better English in this case).

voice " for the simple " saying " ; and omits " straightway " (v. 21).

Verses 24 and 25 are taken over unchanged, except that in 25 Luke changes " out of " into " from."

A comparison like this might be carried out over the whole of the matter common to Mark and Luke. In some places there is distinctly more change than here. But even where there is most change, enough remains to show the character of the Source. Slight alterations to improve the Greek are frequent. Complete refashioning of the thought and expression is rare. Words and phraseology which Luke rarely employs where he is writing freely are retained from the Source. Luke recognized that a certain type of narrative style had been established for the Gospel, and he allowed this to remain. Especially in the beginning of a borrowed paragraph he altered more freely to suit the preceding narrative. From some places it is clear that he did not translate verse by verse, but considered a paragraph or incident as a whole, and transferred touches from one point to another, where they seemed more effective.<sup>1</sup> He studied effect more, or rather, perhaps, he pictured the scene to himself more vividly than Mark did, and lit it up with more vivid forms of language, e.g.—

Mark ii. 3. And they came	Luke v. 18. And behold ! men
carrying unto him.	carrying.

The changes which Luke made have in some rare cases almost the effect of misrepresenting the literal facts ; but this is either for the sake of making the situation more intelligible to his readers, who were Western, not Oriental, or possibly because he doubted the accuracy of some detail in the Source. A good example is briefly noted by the Author, who, however, does not discuss it, but refers in a word to Wellhausen's explanation. This example is fully

<sup>1</sup> Compare Mark ii. 1 and 6 with Luke v. 17 and 21.

discussed in my Essay on the Credibility of Luke (*Was Christ Born at Bethlehem*, pp. 58-64). Mark ii. 4 describes how the bearers of the paralytic stripped off the covering of clay and soil from the (flat) roof of the house, broke a hole in the ceiling, and let down the bed through it. This description was true of the simple Palestinian hut, but was unintelligible to a person who knew only the houses of a Greek or a Roman city. Luke adapts his account of the incident (not to a Greek house, but) to a Roman house, and tells how the bearers of the man who was paralyzed went up on the tiled roof,<sup>1</sup> and let the sick man down through the hole (*impluvium*) which was in the roof of the public room (*atrium*) of every Roman house. There was not a hole of this kind in the roof of Greek houses, and Luke therefore wrote for an audience or a single reader (viz. Theophilus, a Roman official<sup>2</sup>) familiar with Roman houses, i.e. living either in Italy or in some Roman colony like Philippi.<sup>3</sup>

There is no question here that Mark states the actual facts, and Luke misrepresents what occurred. The question is whether Luke, familiar only with Greek or Roman houses, misunderstood the description of the incident on the roof of a rustic hut in Palestine, or intentionally stated the facts in this changed way in order to make the scene more easily intelligible to his readers (or his reader, Theophilus), preserving indeed the general character of the scene, but materially altering the details and surroundings from Palestinian to Italian. But, after all, how small even in this case is the change!—for though a good many sen-

<sup>1</sup> He imitates even the Latin usage, which used the term "the tiles" to indicate the roof.

<sup>2</sup> *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 388.

<sup>3</sup> If we may assume that the Roman style of house was common in this Roman colony. We could hardly make such an assumption about the Colony Corinth, where probably Greek fashion was dominant; but at Philippi the Roman soldiers were numerous.

tences are needed to explain it to the modern reader, it is completed in two or three words in the Greek.

What is most striking as the result of the Author's investigation is (1) the slightness of the changes as a whole that Luke makes in his authority, and the faithfulness with which on the whole he reports his authority, even preserving largely Mark's very simple method of connecting sentences by "and" (*καί*)—a kind of connection which is much rarer in the parts where Luke composes freely.

(2) His almost invariable practice of touching up descriptions of medical matters : on this there will be more to say in the latter part of the present paper.

(3) The way in which, even where he most freely alters, he preserves a certain style of expression, which he evidently considered to be an established and suitable form for the Gospel. This attributes to Luke a marked sense of style and great dramatic propriety in varying style to suit difference of scene and action. This has been the quality of Luke as a stylist that most impressed me during years of study. There is a certain modulation and freedom in his expression, which changes in obedience to the feeling of the moment and to the changes of scene ; and the Author is sensitive to this beyond any other of the German scholars whom I have read. Even Professor Blass, greatest of Lukan editors, has been so taken up with explanation, and attention to readings, and questions of verbal harmony, that he has not been sufficiently (if I may say so) alive to this highest quality of style. In the Author's hands this observation leads to very important results regarding the first two chapters of Luke's Gospel. But, before passing to this much controverted topic, I should like briefly to call attention once more to the paragraph Acts xvi. 6-11 as a specimen of this quality in Luke. It has long appeared to me that this is the most remarkable



paragraph, from a certain point of view, in the whole of Luke's writings: it is most full of himself and his whole view of history and life and his Pauline comprehension, most instinct with vibrating emotion (*St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 200): "the sweep and rush of the narrative is unique in *Acts*: point after point, province after province, are hurried over": Paul is driven on from country to country, Galatic Phrygia, Asian Phrygia, the Bithynian frontier, Mysia, the Troad, and he must have been in despair as to what was to be the outcome of this dark and perplexing journey, until at last the vision and the invitation explained the overruling purpose of all those wanderings. We cannot wonder that the commentators have been so perplexed and nonplussed by this paragraph, and that they have had recourse to such shifts to make their way through it; perplexity is the fact or emotion which underlies the whole passage, and that is what the style brings out. The writer felt that breathless, panting eagerness, so to say; and his style is modelled to suit the emotion. The style is here, and always, almost out of the writer's control: the subject and the emotion compel the style, or, rather, clothe themselves naturally in the suitable words. That is the perfection of style. But it puzzles the commentator. We must here and everywhere in *Acts* follow truth and life and geography.

And, if Paul is here driven on from country to country, if the historian has to hurry over the lands to keep pace with his subject, is not that the whole life of Paul the Christian? Paul thinks imperially: "he talks of Provinces, and as he marches on in his victorious course, he plants his footsteps in their capitals."<sup>1</sup> It is hardly too much to say that all the rest of right Lukan study is an exposition of the meaning and spirit of that one paragraph

<sup>1</sup> *Pauline and other Studies*, p. 198.

where the mind of Luke and the influence of Paul are most perfectly expressed.

Regarding Luke i. and ii., the Author is of the opinion that the historian is dependent entirely on oral tradition, and used no written Source; he regards those chapters as purely legendary. He allows the possibility that the narrative part may depend on an Aramaic written Source translated by Luke himself; but he is not favourably disposed to this view, and he is absolutely convinced that the hymns of Mary, i. 46-55, and Zacharias, i. 68-79, are the free composition of Luke himself, that they were originated in the Greek form, and never had an Aramaic form. The proof lies in the fact that the language and style are so thoroughly Lukan, adapted with extraordinary skill from fragments of the Old Testament (the Septuagint).

Considerable part of this view seems to be highly probable. I have always felt and maintained that Luke regarded this part of his history as being a pure addition made by him to the Gospel as recorded by his predecessors: he had obtained it from oral, not literary sources.<sup>1</sup> He believed, however, that those sources were good, and he would not have been satisfied with mere oral tradition. The man who wrote i. 1-4 could never have gone on to give in i. 5 ff. a mere popular tale, or have invented without any authority such hymns as those of Mary and Zacharias. Exaggeration and overdoing of a view fundamentally correct is here the character of the Author's opinions.

The Author does not draw the following inferences, but they seem to follow from what he does say. The style of Luke's history is governed according to the gradual evolution of the Christian Church out of its Jewish cradle. It is most strongly Biblical (i.e. taken from the Septuagint Greek) and Hebraistic in describing the birth and early

<sup>1</sup> *Christ Born at Bethlehem*, chap. iv.

years of Jesus. In describing the life and death and words of Christ it is less Biblical, but still is deeply tinged with Hebraism, while in many parts it shows strong traces of non-Lukan style due to the use of written Sources. In describing the earliest stage of the Palestinian Church after the death of the Lord, it continued to be distinctly Hebraistic, and in parts the *Acts* even go beyond the later parts of the Gospel in the intensity of the Hebraistic tinge, as if marking the narrowed spirit of the early Church, which had hardly yet begun to understand the universality of Christ's message. In the second half of *Acts* (except in chap. xv. and in some of the scenes at Jerusalem, where the earlier Hebraistic tone is perceptible) it is most thoroughly Greek and Lukan. The preface to the whole history, Luke i. 1-4, is on the same level as the second half of *Acts*, in excellent and markedly individual Greek—here we have the true and natural Luke. As the Author says, the problem of the language and style of the Third Gospel taken by itself, would be insoluble, but by the aid of comparison with the *Acts*, everything is clear. It may be doubted, however, whether the Sources in the Third Gospel could be disentangled, were it not that we can recover the originals independently of Luke, through their survival in the Gospels of Mark and Matthew.

I do not mean that Luke was unconscious of the variation in style: such an assertion would be ridiculous. But he did not originate the variation—his subject originated it; and he did not employ it for mere literary and artistic effect, as the Author definitely maintains, but for historical reasons, as a means of conveying more clearly and effectively his meaning.

The use of the two forms, Hierosolyma and Jerusalem, which appear side by side in Luke's Gospel and *Acts*, shows both that Luke must have been conscious of the difference,

and that he did not originate the idea of using it for effective presentation of his subject. There is no trace of attention to this difference in the other Gospels<sup>1</sup>; but it is clearly present in the writings of Paul, who probably originated it. The form Jerusalem occurs twice in *Galatians*, Hierosolyma three times: the latter is in that Epistle clearly a geographical term, the former is hieratic and Judaistic, as it is in *Revelation* and *Hebrews*. A similar distinction can on the whole be traced in *Luke*, though it is partly obscured by various causes (notably by uncertainty, and sometimes perhaps by corruption, in the text).

I. Hierosolyma occurs only four times in the Third Gospel,<sup>2</sup> always very definitely in a geographical sense, while Jerusalem occurs twenty-six times: some of the latter cases are mainly geographical in sense, but the atmosphere of the passage, the spirit of the context, may be regarded as determining the form to be employed. Some of these cases are in passages common either to Mark or to Matthew; and Luke has deliberately altered the form used. But most are in passages or in clauses peculiar to Luke. The following list tells its own tale.

II. Passages peculiar to Luke: name Jerusalem occurs in Luke ii. five times; Luke x. 30; in xiii. three times; xvii. 11; xix. 11; xxiii. 28; xxiv., five times.

III. Passages common to Luke with Matthew or Mark, or both:—

Luke iv. 9.	Jerusalem.	Mt.	The holy city.
„ v. 17.	„	Mt., Mk.	omit.
„ vi. 17.	„	„ „	Hierosolyma.
„ ix. 31.	„	„ „	omit.

<sup>1</sup> They all use only the form Hierosolyma, except that Matthew once has Jerusalem. The latter form is almost confined to Paul and Luke in the New Testament; exceptions are noted above.

<sup>2</sup> Always in passages that have no parallel in Mark or Matthew. The statistics in the text are taken from Moulton and Geden.



Luke ix. 51.	Jerusalem.	Mt.	Mk.	omit.
„ ix. 53.	„	„	„	„
„ xviii. 31	„	„	„	Hierosolyma.
„ xxi. 20, 24	„	„	„	omit.

Thus, while Luke has frequently the form Jerusalem, he uses it only twice in places where Matthew or Mark actually employ the other form. It is a principle of verbal suitability which is peculiar to himself among the Evangelists, one which he almost certainly learned from Paul.<sup>1</sup>

IV. In Acts i.-xii., xv., Jerusalem occurs twenty-five times, Hierosolyma six times.

V. In Acts xiii., xiv., xvi. ff., Jerusalem occurs fourteen times, Hierosolyma nineteen times (but according to the text of WH., the numbers are twelve and twenty-one). Many of the places where the form Jerusalem is used are markedly Hieratic and Hebraizing.

While details in some cases are uncertain, the general result of these statistics is clear. Luke did, beyond doubt or question, attach some meaning to the distinction of form. He deliberately and intentionally chose sometimes one, sometimes the other. He was not guided by his Source, for in some few cases he changes the name used in his Source, and in other cases inserts the name where the Source did not use it. The distinction is clearest where he depends on eye-witness, and had no written Source. The distinction has no literary value, but only a historical and real value. It was used as a device to express meaning, not to give external and formal beauty. Professor Harnack, who maintains that Luke aimed at the latter kind of effect alone, without any thought of the former, cannot explain such a fact as this. Finally, Luke took the distinction from Paul, in whose case it would be ridiculous to

<sup>1</sup> The idea that Paul adopted it from Luke may be dismissed without hesitation. Their usage cannot be independent of one another, if they were friends and companions. Paul may have taken it from a predecessor.

think of a conscious striving after formal and artistic or rhetorical effect.

The case is similar to the distinction between the names Saul and Paul. Luke consciously and deliberately uses the former to indicate the Apostle in his character as a Hebrew, the latter in his character as a citizen of the Græco-Roman world. I have little to add to, and nothing to retract from, the exposition of the meaning of this distinction given in *St. Paul the Traveller*, pp. 81-8. Here again we have a distinction used by Luke, in regard to which no one can dream of any striving on his part for artistic or literary effect: it originates entirely in the delicate perception of real fact and historic truth.

In respect of Luke's style, I regret to find myself in one important respect holding a view diametrically opposed to that of the Author. The style appears to me natural, unforced, determined by the subject in hand. The Author, on the contrary, takes the view that Luke's style is extremely artificial and elaborated (pp. 80 f., 152), that he paid the most minute and careful attention to the form and external qualities of style, but was careless to the last degree of fact and truth and consistency. It has been pointed out in the first part of this review what is the fixed idea and motive that unconsciously induces the Author to exaggerate (as I venture to think) the inconsistencies and the artificiality, the contempt for facts and the devotion to verbal art, that he discovers in Luke. He seems to me to have often been misled by that fixed idea into complete misunderstanding of Luke's method of narration. For example, he thinks that Luke in Acts xvi. 27 describes the jailor as not having observed the earthquake, but only its consequence, the opened doors. It is quite evident that Professor Harnack has never had the misfortune (or, shall I say, the good fortune? for it is a good preparation for

appreciating this passage) to live in a country subject to earthquakes. If he had, he would never think it necessary for the historian to record that a person, who was wakened from sleep by an earthquake (as the jailor was wakened), was cognizant of the fact that an earthquake had occurred, for no person lives through an earthquake without perceiving it. Luke and his readers knew better about earthquakes; and when he described the earthquake and its consequences, and added that the jailor was wakened, he could reckon on every one of his readers understanding without formal mention that the jailor perceived the earthquake. He who reads Luke without applying practical sense and mother wit and experience will always misunderstand him; and one of the chief purposes of my *St. Paul the Traveller* was to illustrate the fact that these qualities must be constantly applied in studying Luke. When you think you find an "inconsistency" in Luke, you should look carefully whether you have been applying these qualities sufficiently, before you condemn the supposed fault.

The Author is not disposed to admit that any written Source was used by Luke in the first half of Acts. He rejects with contempt all the numerous speculations about Sources used in the Acts i.-xii. as empty, unmethodical and valueless, excepting only the attempt of Bernhard Weiss to prove that one such written Source can be traced here and there in Acts i.-xv.: Weiss detects numerous inconsistencies, and explains these by the hypothesis that Luke was here only a Redactor, who failed to harmonize his material thoroughly. But, so far as language and style go, the Author finds no part of Acts i.-xv. that can be separated from the rest as showing signs of a different hand and expression, whereas in the Third Gospel the parts common to Luke and Mark, and those common to Luke and Matthew, show such signs distinctly. On the ground of difficulties

regarding facts and the treatment of facts, the Author is disposed to consider that Luke used a written Source for the episodes in which Peter plays the chief part ; but the Source was Aramaic and Luke translated it himself, so that his own style appears alone in the Greek form.<sup>1</sup> Even in this case, however, the hypothesis that oral information alone was used by Luke cannot (in his opinion) be convincingly disproved.

The Author rightly attaches great importance to the proof that the writer of the Third Gospel and the *Acts* was a physician. The same personality is felt throughout. The proofs are found in all parts of the work, both those written by Luke as an eye-witness and those which he has borrowed from Sources that are known to us. The Author enumerates six classes of proofs.

1. The presentation of the subject as a whole to the reader is determined to a certain degree by point of view, aims and ideals of a medical character.

2. Acts of healing are recorded in abundance and with especial interest.

3. The language of the history is coloured by the speech of physicians (in the way of technical medical terms, etc.).

These three proofs, however, are not sufficient. Jesus did much as the great physician and healer ; and it must be the case that the four Gospels should vary in the attention which they pay to this side of his work and character, and that one must go beyond the others in this respect. This would not prove that the one who goes beyond the others was a physician. But these proofs are raised to a demonstration by the following reasons :—

4. The description of the several cases of sickness men-

<sup>1</sup> In the Third Gospel the parts common to Luke and Matthew rest ultimately on an Aramaic Source, but the Author considers that Luke used a Greek translation from the original Aramaic, and did not himself translate.



tioned shows the observation and knowledge that belong to a physician.

5. The language of Luke, even when he is not treating of medical matters and acts of healing, has a medical colour.

6. Where Luke is speaking as an eye-witness, the medical element is specially clearly visible.

The proof of these six propositions lies in the cumulative effect of a great number of small details scattered over the whole of *Acts* and the Gospel. It is, of course, impossible to give any analysis of such a demonstration. There are few striking cases to quote even as specimens; and one or two samples would give no conception of the strength of the cumulative proof. What is perhaps the most effective instance was quoted in the first part of this paper, *EXPOSITOR*, Dec. 1906, p. 492.

This topic leads up to a question, which I do not remember to have seen adequately discussed. Even in the passages that have been taken over by Luke from the Source which we still possess almost in its original form in the Gospel of Mark, wherever there occurs any reference to illness or medical treatment of sick persons, Luke almost invariably alters the expression more or less, as in v. 18 he changes the term "a paralytic" of Mark ii. 3<sup>1</sup> to "a man who was paralysed." He could hardly ever rest satisfied with the popular untrained language used about medical matters by Mark.<sup>2</sup>

In some cases the change does not imply really more than is contained in the original Source, and amounts only to a more scientific and medically accurate description of the fact related in the Source. But in other cases a real

<sup>1</sup> "A man sick of the palsy" in the Authorized Version.

<sup>2</sup> This is the second class of alterations on Mark, systematically introduced by Luke, as mentioned on p. 107.

addition to knowledge is involved, as appears, e.g., from the following examples :—

1. Mark iii. 1 speaks of a man with a withered hand ; Luke vi. 6 adds that it was the right hand : the medical mind demands such specification.

2. Luke viii. 27 adds to Mark v. 2 that the possessed man had for a long time worn no clothes : this was a symptom of the insanity that a physician would not willingly omit.

3. In Luke viii. 55 the physician mentions that Jairus' daughter called for food (cf. Mark v. 42). Various other examples occur.

In such cases are we to suppose that Luke simply made these additions without any authority, inventing them as natural and probable ? That is the Author's decided opinion (p. 130, n. 4) ; according to him, these are examples of Luke's carelessness about fact and truth. But why must we suppose that Luke, who in the Author's opinion had access to so many oral sources of information, and who so often used sources of this kind in both books of his history, never had access to any oral authority for any event narrated by Mark ? Is it not more natural to suppose that the authorities with whom he had conversed told him sometimes about incidents which Mark records ; and that, while he preferred to use Mark's account as his basis, he made additions in some cases from other authorities ? Those who reject wholly the possibility that Luke could have had access to any good oral authority, who possessed first-hand knowledge of the facts, are justified in regarding those additions as pure invention ; but it seems inconsistent in the Author to maintain that Luke's witnesses (whom he admits to be first-rate) confined their statements strictly to matters that Mark omitted.

The question inevitably arises, What effect will this book

have on general opinion? The interest and value of the book, as has been already said,<sup>1</sup> seems to lie rather in the evolution of the thought of a striking modern personality, viz., the distinguished Author, than in the study of Luke. It shows the Author on the threshold of the twentieth century thought, yet not able completely to shake off the fetters and emerge out of the narrow methods of the nineteenth century.

It may be doubted whether Professor Harnack's book, highly as we must estimate the ability and the clever ratiocination displayed in it, will change any one's opinion or convince any one who was not already convinced of the truth that Luke the companion of Paul wrote the Third Gospel and the Acts. Its method is too deeply infected with the vice of most modern investigations into questions of the kind: it is too purely verbal; it has too little hold on realities and facts. The history of literary criticism of ancient documents during the last fifty years has demonstrated that by such purely verbal criticism one can prove anything and nothing. Almost all the real progress that has been made comes from the discovery of new evidence, and not from verbal criticism of the old books. It is only by bringing the old books into comparison with facts and life that they can be profitably studied.

It is difficult to think that the author himself can attach value to the verbal proofs which he gathers together in his third Appendix, as showing that the letter of the Council in Jerusalem, Acts xv. 23-29, is the free composition of Luke without any written authority. I cannot imagine that the Author arrived at his opinion on the strength of the verbal evidence, which is singularly weak and conflicting; and, in fact, he confesses on p. 154 that the verbal arguments are perhaps less important than the reasons of

<sup>1</sup> EXPOSITOR, Dec. 1906, p. 488.

fact and history. One feels that his opinion was reached first on the latter ground, and the verbal reasons are mere buttresses added afterwards in the attempt to support the tottering pile. One notes with real regret the special pleading in the comments on xv. 23, where *κατά* in *οἱ κατά τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν καὶ Συρίαν* is proved to be a Lukan usage (as if anyone could doubt this) by comparison with the totally different sense of *κατά* in Acts ii. 10, *Διβόης τῆς κατὰ Κυρήνην*. It needs no demonstration that Luke could use the preposition with an accusative, but so could any other Greek speaker from the Danube to the Nile, and from the Atlantic Ocean to the Persian Gulf. And the attempt to make out, in defiance of the plain sense and linguistic usage, that *οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ἀδελφοί* is the easy reading and *οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί* the more difficult reading, and therefore more liable to alteration, mixes up argument and meaning in the style of a lawyer pleading for a bad case.

The same character attaches to much of the commentary on the following verses. What bearing has it on the question whether the Council or Luke composed the letter that *ἀπαγγέλλειν* (which is found in verse 27) is used by Luke twenty-five times, by Mark only twice, and John twice? <sup>1</sup> What reason does this give for thinking that the Apostles could not use the word? Paul uses it twice, the Epistle to the Hebrews has it, the Septuagint has it, Matthew uses it eight times.

Why point out that Matthew and Mark do not use the perfect of *ἀποστέλλω*; as if that had any, even the remotest bearing on the question? Both use the verb very frequently, and as a matter of fact Matthew has the perfect passive in xxiii. 37. John uses the verb and its perfect freely. Paul, Peter, and *Hebrews* have it (the first using even the perfect

<sup>1</sup> There are some textual differences on this point. Moulton and Geden give it five times in Mark, three times in John.



active). Similar remarks rise to one's lips in a good many other parts of this short commentary : many of the notes are absolutely irrelevant, and prove nothing, do not even point towards anything. Why heap them up ? They merely weaken the Author's argument, for they show that he has tried every way and found nothing to buttress his case.

But, while the Author spends several pages in this discussion, he does not explain his position on the really important questions that arise about this letter. His position is far more difficult in this instance than that of the more thoroughgoing "critics," who maintain that *Acts* was composed by a late writer : they find it quite natural that this late writer should have to make up this document from his own resources. But the Author considers that the historical Luke, the companion of Paul, wrote the *Acts*, and that Luke was in the closest relations with Paul on the very journey in which he describes Paul as delivering this letter to all his non-Jewish converts in the Galatian cities as an authoritative guide for their conduct in life. Luke certainly makes it clear and inevitable that this Decree of the Council at Jerusalem was the solution of the difficulty for himself and for all in his position. Now what every one asks from the Author, and what he is bound to furnish, is some explanation of the matter. How does it come that Luke was so entirely ignorant of the words of a Decree which he describes as of such immense importance, and which Paul had in his hands when he met Luke at Troas ? Or if Luke knew the words of the Decree, does the Author seriously believe, and wish to make us believe, that the historian threw aside the real Decree and composed a sham one in its place. Finally the Author must explain what he considers to be the relation between the sham Decree and the real one. Do they state the same thing, or different things ? If the same, why does Luke in this case rewrite a document

entirely, whereas in other cases (as the Author proves so carefully and so conclusively) he retains so much of his original Source? Or does the Author consider that the Council was a pure fiction, the Decree a mere invention, and the story that Paul carried it to Antioch and delivered it to his Galatian converts an elaborate lie? If that be so, how does he reconcile this with Lukan authorship? He declares that Luke is to the last degree careless of truth and consistency; but such elaborate falsification goes far beyond mere carelessness.

These are not questions that can be evaded. They must be answered, in order to make Professor Harnack's view intelligible and rational to us, who desire to understand him. It is not sufficient to waive them aside (as the Author does) as discussed by others; for these others think differently about essential points.

Here the argument is mainly of words; yet one does not feel that it was through these studies of words that the Author attained his present opinions. Where the verbal argument of this book possesses demonstrative value, it has more than words to rest on. Thus, in the study of the parts common to Mark and Luke, the reasoning rests on the firm foundation of the original written Source, and investigates the process by which Luke transformed this original into the words of the Third Gospel. In the study of the "We"-passages, it has a large extent of varied narrative to deal with, and it cannot wholly neglect the facts. But, when the Author takes small pieces like the song of Mary or the Decree of the Council of Jerusalem, and analyses the language and rests purely on verbal statistics, we fail to find strength in the reasoning.

Take as a specimen with which to finish off this paper, the passage Acts xxviii. 9 f., which is very fully discussed by the Author twice (pp. 11 f. and 123 f.). He argues that

the true meaning of the passage was not understood until medical language was compared, when it was shown that the word *καθήψεν*, by which the act of the viper to Paul's hand is described, implies "bit," and not merely "fastened upon." But it is a well-assured fact that the viper, a poisonous snake, only strikes, fixes the poison-fangs in the flesh for a moment, and withdraws its head instantly. Its action could never be what is attributed by Luke the eye-witness to this Maltese viper; that it clung to Paul's hand, and had to be shaken off into the fire by him. On the other hand, constrictors, which have no poison fangs, cling in the way described, but as a rule do not bite. Are we then to understand, in spite of the medical style and the authority of Professor Blass (who translates "momordit" in his edition) that the viper "fastened upon" the Apostle's hand (*καθήψεν*). Then, the very name "viper" is a difficulty. Was Luke mistaken about the kind of snake which he saw? A trained medical man in ancient times was usually a good authority about serpents, to which great respect was paid in ancient medicine and custom.

Mere verbal study is here utterly at fault. We can make no progress without turning to the realities and facts of Maltese natural history. A correspondent<sup>1</sup> obligingly informed me years ago that Mr. Bryan Hook, of Farnham, Surrey (who, my correspondent assures me, is a thoroughly good naturalist), had found in Malta a small snake, *Coronella Austriaca*, which is rare in England, but common in many parts of Europe. It is a constrictor, without poison-fangs, which would cling to the hand or arm as Luke describes. It is similar in size to the viper, and so like in markings and general appearance that Mr. Hook, when he caught his specimen, thought he was killing a viper.

My friend, Professor J. W. H. Trail, of Aberdeen, whom

<sup>1</sup> Mr. A. Sloman, Kingslee, Farndon, Chester.

I consulted, replied that *Coronella lævis*, or *Austriaca*, is known in Sicily and the adjoining islands; but he can find no evidence of its existence in Malta. It is known to be rather irritable, and to fix its small teeth so firmly into the human skin as to hang on and need a little force to pull it off, though the teeth are too short to do any real injury to the skin. *Coronella* is at a glance very much like a viper; and in the flames it would not be closely examined. While it is not reported as found in Malta except by Mr. Hook, two species are known there belonging to the same family and having similar habits, *leopardinus* and *zamenis* (or *coluber*) *gemonensis*. The colouring of *C. leopardinus* would be the most likely to suggest a viper.

These observations justify Luke entirely. We have here a snake so closely resembling a viper as to be taken for one by a good naturalist until he had caught and examined a specimen. It clings, and yet it also bites without doing harm. That the Maltese rustics should mistake this harmless snake for a venomous one is not strange. Many uneducated people have the idea that all snakes are poisonous in varying degrees, just as the vulgar often firmly believe that toads are poisonous. Every detail as related by Luke is natural, and in accordance with the facts of the country.

The Author quite fairly quotes this passage as an example of Luke's love for the marvellous. One cannot doubt that the reason for its appearance in Luke's history is that it seemed to the writer a proof of Paul's marvellous powers. We see now that, while it was bound to appear marvellous to Luke, the event was quite simple and natural. No one can doubt, probably hardly any scholar has ever doubted, that the incident is narrated by an eye-witness: it is so vivid and so direct, so evidently a transcript from life, that its character is self-evident. But of what value would mere verbal examination be in this case without investigation of



the real facts and surroundings in which the incident occurred ? It is the same throughout Luke's history from beginning to end. One may refer to the incidents of the stoning and reviving of Paul at Lystra, and the recovery of Eutychus at Troas, which are not necessarily marvellous, but which both Luke and the public assuredly considered to be so ; yet (as is shown in *St. Paul the Traveller*) Luke, while revealing what was the general belief and his own, describes the events simply and accurately, without intruding anything that forces on the reader his own marvellous interpretation.

W. M. RAMSAY.

*ROBERT RAINY.*

WHEN in 1862, at the age of six-and-thirty, Robert Rainy was appointed Professor of Church History in the New College, Edinburgh, in succession to Principal Cunningham, it appeared as if he had been destined by Providence to the life of a scholar. And for such a vocation he had manifest qualifications.

He had the brooding mind. On whatever subject he spoke, he created the impression of having pondered it long and deeply. On most subjects the majority of readers or hearers were soon made aware that, however far they had penetrated, he had been as far, and probably farther. Not only did he attack a subject from every side, but he seemed to get his hand right underneath it. His own psychological processes were so subtle and comprehensive that he naturally worked with the psychological method; and, Church History being his subject, there was plenty of scope for its application. He never contemplated history as a mere pageant, as Dean Stanley did; still less did he take heretics and knock their heads together, as his predecessor, Dr. Cunningham, had done. In dealing with departures from orthodoxy, he took you to the point where the divergence had commenced, and showed how, in the heretic's circumstances, it was not unnatural that he should mistake the path, and that, indeed, if you had been at the same pass, you might have done the same. He seemed to feel his way through the systems of the great thinkers from the inside, instead of exhibiting them as objects to be contemplated from the outside. You saw how the thinker, having placed the one foot down here, was bound to put the other there; and so on, till the whole circle of his thinking was explained.

It is only saying the same thing in other words, to re-

mark that he was a personality. This is what students desire above all things in a professor. It was almost as interesting to find out what new light any subject, as he discussed it, cast upon Rainy, as to discover what new light he could cast upon the subject. While he had not the extraordinary mental brilliance and literary skill of Professor Davidson, who was lecturing in the same college at the same time, he had more weight and more intricacy, and, therefore, was quite as much a subject of discussion and anecdotage. He created in his students the belief that he could do anything. For many years there lingered about the college an understanding that he was engaged in the composition of a work on St. Augustine; and the merits of this production were as devout an article of faith as if it had been actually written and published. Perhaps the topic on which in his time the minds of students were most troubled was the Atonement; and it was loyally believed that, if he could only find time to write a treatise on it, all the difficulties of the age would be cleared up. I have myself earnestly urged him to write this work; and he was good enough to keep his gravity under my rhapsodies. Into his ear there were poured more of the confessions and confidences of students than were entrusted to any of his colleagues. For such sacred work he was admirably qualified: he had been there himself; he was patient and undogmatic; and he could, in such circumstances, say things that reached far and gave real relief. I remember how he astonished me by saying that the definitions of the Trinity and the Person of Christ were not so much exact statements of fact as the nearest approaches man could make to that which is inexpressible.

Of learning he might have had more. But he had enough to know where to go for the information he required; and his lectures gave the impression of a good deal of reading

in the sources. *The Ancient Catholic Church*, the latest of his publications, is substantially a reproduction of his class-lectures on the first four or five centuries ; and a perusal of its pages will confirm this impression. He is singularly happy also in the characterization of the great leaders of the past. The following sentences, extracted from his description of Athanasius, may appear to some no bad delineation of the author himself :—

Athanasius possessed the eye for men and for affairs, and the purpose to make all his resources tell for the cause he served, which are the main elements of statesmanship—in his case statesmanship sustained by faith, and therefore never owning or accepting defeat. He was not understood to possess, like Origen, the learning due to enormous reading ; the circumstances of his life forbade it. Nor was he a religious genius, like Augustine. His knowledge and his range of religious insight and sympathy were, no doubt, adequate to the representation of a great cause, and have commanded the respect of theologians down to our time. But Athanasius was, most of all, a commanding personality : one who impressed, controlled and mastered men ; one whom his followers enthusiastically trusted, and whom his enemies feared and hated. He did not quite live to see the result which was to reward his efforts and sacrifices ; but he saw the beginning of that memorable close. And he left behind him an impression of consistent greatness hardly paralleled in the annals of the Church.

Professor Salmond, one of the editors of the series in which this work appeared, was extremely desirous that more of the lectures should be reproduced in this shape ; and the author was in no degree unwilling. He spoke to me with great earnestness of his desire to proceed with the publication. His lectures on Modern German Theology, if he had been able to go on so far, would, I am persuaded, have been found of permanent value.

The book, however, which must be looked upon as the most spontaneous production of his genius, and which had for a long time to serve alone to outsiders as an indication of his mind, is *The Delivery and Development of Christian*



*Doctrine*, the Cunningham Lectures for 1873. It was occasioned partly by the speculations of Matthew Arnold, on the one hand, disparaging doctrine, and partly by the writings of Newman, on the other, exaggerating it ; but it really contains a great deal of the author's own most intimate thinking, and it will be found full of the seeds of things by those whose mental development has chanced to proceed on similar lines. It may be said to stand midway between the theology of Dr. Cunningham on the one hand and that of Dr. Robertson Smith and Dr. Bruce on the other. There is much of the spirit of Dr. Cunningham in the importance attributed to doctrine, though there is far more appreciation than was exhibited by that divine of the human element in revelation. The contrast is equally striking with the younger theologians as regards the reverence with which revealed truth is handled ; yet there is full recognition of the necessity for handling it as a historical magnitude. The same range of subjects is embraced as in the epoch-making work of Rothe, entitled *Zur Dogmatik* ; but, as far as I remember, there is no reference to this fact ; and the conclusions reached are widely different.

The principal point of contrast with Rothe is the reserve exhibited in connexion with inspiration. As is well known, Rothe completely rejected the traditional doctrine on this subject, attacking its positions and defences with a severity and an eloquence similar to those displayed by Coleridge when championing the same cause in *The Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit*. It might have been thought that it would be impossible to write about the delivery and development of doctrine without taking up this theme, this being the point at which the revealing mind and the human mind meet. The writer could not be unaware how much the general attention was occupied with this topic at the time. Yet he evades it ; or, it may be truer to say,

he does not feel the difficulty. He has the immediate intuition which the Reformers had of the inspiration in the Scriptures. Thus he says curtly (p. 356): "The efforts made to show that the New Testament is not inspired—i.e., which is the same thing, that the writings it contains are due merely to the influences which operate in the minds of religious men at any great crisis of religious history—all such efforts may be set down as labour thrown away. On the mind of each generation of Christians these writings impress their claims with an evidence which outlives all objections."

The revelation of truth about God's nature and intentions, about man's sin and destiny, and about the means of salvation, seemed to him one of the great necessities of human nature and one of the leading instances of the mercy and grace of God; and in the Bible he found this information supplied with such an amplitude and wisdom as carry on their face the proof of divinity. He does not separate between the revealing God, the Book in which the revelation is transmitted, and the men who penned the writing; all three are one phenomenon; and it is a phenomenon of unique and unmistakable quality. Thus he says:—

Here I raise no debate as to the state of mind in which the inspired man should be conceived to be, or how far his insight extends. I neither know nor care. It is enough for me, that, speaking in the Spirit, he speaks out of the fulness of a supreme insight and a supreme wisdom. These are the resources which, through whatever experiences and workings of his own mind, conscious or unconscious, are translated into the effects with which we deal. And, when I ask again, What sources do the New Testament writers draw from, and in what method do they proceed?—I reply, Let those say who have felt how these writers, as from the centre of some bright world, of which they are a part, and which they perfectly behold, speak out to us, approaching from the outside and from below, apprehending feebly what they deliver so certainly and so fitly.

Let us suppose that I have some experiences to go through, and that, in order to go through them successfully, an acquaintance is needed with the principles and applications of some science, some body of truth complex and far-reaching, involving abstract principles that branch out in all directions. Let me suppose that I have only the most vague and dim notions of this whole department of knowledge. Let me suppose that one who is a master of all science, and of this science, takes me in hand to meet this pressing difficulty. He says to me, Do not give way to bewilderment. I cannot make you in an hour or two a master of this science, yet, if you will attend to me, I will give you enough of what you need to know, to guide you through what lies before you, intelligently, advantageously, safely. So he begins, keeping always in view my practical exigency, my stage of knowledge, my degree of capacity, and measuring and proportioning his statements by this point of view. He tells me the facts and the processes, the forces and the conditions, with which I shall have to deal. That I may deal with them intelligently, he explains them as he goes, drawing forth principles, so far as I can take them in, so far as they are required with a view to my experiences. He does not always confine himself to what is barely necessary for the bare practical exigency. Partly because he respects my desire to understand, partly because gratified intellectual interest fixes my knowledge by illuminating it and connecting it, he goes here and there a little further out into theory, and shows me lines of principles stretching away into regions which cannot for the present be explained. All through he dexterously adapts whatever he says to my actual state ; he dovetails his instruction into my actual mental condition ; he links what he brings to what he knows me to have beforehand ; familiar experiences of mine become analogies to illustrate, and fixed points by which to hold, the new knowledge ; familiar applications are suggested, experiments that I might make, whereby to see with my eyes how the forces work. The lesson is a marvel of adaptive skill, and at the end he repeats : Now attend to what I have said, and it will take you safely through. But all these things which he has said, as he says them, are part of a complete world of ordered thought that dwells within him,—a knowledge not fragmentary but complete. And even in his concrete illustrations, his condescensions to my ignorance, in his very phrasing of them, there are shades, and accuracies, and nice distinctions, that would be very significant, to one who knew a little more than I, how the operation of various principles that concur and limit one another is full before his mind, and is provided for in his speech. He is fetching out of the great array of ordered truth at his disposal this here, and that there, which my exigency requires, and putting it in shapes that adapt it to me ; yet so that the harmony and per-

spicuity of the rounded truth is nowhere really violated. For me, meanwhile, it is well if my provisional and imperfect perceptions so keep the tracks laid down for them, that I truly hold the facts and guiding notes delivered, and that I enter genuinely into the glimpses of science given me, so as to have my practice illuminated and made intelligent, and to have the spirit of research awakened for the days to come.

Not very different from the case supposed is the case we have before us. For, if our knowledge is not quite so hasty, and not so fragmentary, and not quite so provisional and occasional, as the illustration supposes, yet how far, on the other side, does His supreme insight, who is our teacher, rise above the [measure of all the masters of earthly knowledge! So, then, the apostles, speaking in the spirit of their Master, draw, from a knowledge that is not in part, so much as shall serve the occasions of the life of faith for a few hundred or a few thousand years. They aim not at one department of the man only, but rather at the whole mood of mind that ought to be cherished, and the whole working of the man that ought to be set agoing. Into these dogma enters as an element, sometimes as the leading and prevailing element, but not as the only one. And then, it is generally not a single dogma singly analyzed and extricated, but a certain complex of beliefs in their mutual connexion and influence, that is presented and inculcated. Resting on the facts of the divine history of redemption, they fetch down principles from above, as it were, the full bearings and relations of which are apparent to them, or are apparent to the Spirit in whom they speak; and they show to us some of these relations and bearings. They bring them to bear in the manner of direct insight. They do not speak like men following out patiently abstractions of their own minds, but like men who see the thing with their own eyes; so that even their argumentative illustration is not in the way of painful analysis of thought, but is sudden, powerful, broken, hastening from point to point, as if some scene were rushing into view, and the connexion of its parts not thought out, but seen. Hence, as in the case supposed, so in this, the sentences have a meaning so full and deep that, while the immediate intention for us is discernible, there is always room for further insight. Nor does this remark apply only to the mind of the author in his sentence. In the very utterance of it there is a pregnancy, not as of men paring down their words to the strictness of theory, but as of men filled with the complex greatness and fulness of the reality they see.

This supreme insight, with its direct effect on the utterance characterizes all Bible teaching. We also will utter our theology so when we are inspired—not till then in this world.



This is a very favourable specimen of his powers of exposition ; and it is highly characteristic of his attitude towards Holy Scripture. If, however, the deposit of truth in the Scripture is of this quantity and quality, is not the Biblical expression of it sufficient ? No, says the author : it is necessary for man not only to have the truth spoken to him in the language of the Revealer, but to speak it out in his own words, in order to prove whether or not he has rightly apprehended it and to become able, through successive attempts, to express it more adequately. This is the *rationale* of all doctrines and dogmas. There is a vast difference between the truth as delivered in Scripture and the truth as apprehended in actual experience. History proves that the Church, after the close of the Canon, had to begin at the beginning and attempt like a child to express in its own words what the Revealer had expressed in His words ; and the process has gone on century after century, with innumerable mistakes and imperfections, yet on the whole with success and growing maturity.

It is characteristic that the author does not defend the process of constructing doctrine or dogma on the ground of the claim of science to present knowledge in a perfect form or on the ground of the exigencies of Church life, though of course both are recognized, but by the necessities of the spiritual life of the individual. Doctrine is implicit in experience, but tends by its own nature to become explicit. It is a native instinct of the soul to know the God and Saviour by whom it has been redeemed ; and, the more fully it knows, the more comprehensive and tenacious does the grasp of faith become. The powers of knowing in the human subject are not isolated, but advance or regress with all the other elements of experience ; and it is a poor tribute to truth to suppose that, if the mind does not happen to possess it, something else will do quite as well.

The discussion is throughout very abstract ; but, at the close, it comes down to the common earth in a chapter on the Functions of Creeds, where numerous points are touched upon which are of perennial interest. As a whole, this chapter is a powerful vindication of the legitimacy and necessity of such documents, while, however, no concealment is made of the evil they may occasion by committing churches hopelessly to false and antiquated positions.

It is probably to the abstractness of the discussion, that the comparative ineffectiveness of this book, as a book, is due. On one occasion he spoke to me very frankly about the fact that his books did not sell. Describing a circle in the air with his finger, he remarked, " You know, I have always been too contented to know that the point lay somewhere thereabouts, instead of saying that it is there " (giving a dab in the air with his forefinger). " You know," he went on, " I have no style ; and the reason of this defect, I think, is that, when I was a young minister at Huntly, I did not write my sermons, but trusted to the preparation of the ideas, when I ought to have written at least one discourse a week and so acquired grace and force of diction."

It may be that there was a strain of indolence in his nature, and that an external stimulus was requisite to cause his mind to work at its full vigour. I have seen him at the commencement of a meeting, over which he was presiding, state the subject with the utmost apparent unconcern, almost falling asleep over his task ; but in the course of the proceedings something occurred to rouse him ; when, in a moment, he became another man and spoke with irresistible energy.

Happily such an external stimulus came at a critical hour in his history when, in 1872, Dean Stanley was brought down by the Broad Church party in Scotland, to give a

reading of Scottish history, in the form of a course of Lectures before the Philosophical Society of Edinburgh, the main drift of which was to cast mild ridicule on the Covenanters and to vindicate and extol the Moderates. On the spot Rainy gave the answer. The last of Stanley's lectures was delivered on January 12th, and on the earliest days when the Music Hall could be procured for the purpose—on the 24th, the 26th, and the 31st of the same month—Rainy delivered three lectures in reply. The building was crowded every time with an audience whose enthusiasm went on increasing till it reached white heat. I had the privilege of hearing these lectures ; and I shall never forget the scene at a passage where the lecturer was vindicating his country against the taunts of the Southerner : the audience rose *en masse* and continued to fill the hall with deafening cheers, till old Dr. Harry Rainy of Glasgow, the lecturer's father, a venerable figure with white hair, who was sitting beside his son, started to his feet and stretched his arms aloft, as if to deprecate a tide of emotion which was overwhelming. Rainy knew his subject perfectly ; his deepest feelings had been stirred ; the attack had come from a man with a great and well deserved reputation ; so that the powers of anyone accepting the office of replying had to be put on the strain. Rainy rose to the occasion not only with the requisite ability but with a dignity and grace equal to Stanley's own. The answer, which was generally felt to be crushing, assumed a national character—the reply of Scotland to a traducer—and there can be no doubt that, by stepping out so promptly and effectively to speak for his country, Rainy immensely advanced his position as a public character.

It may have been due to the enthusiasm of youth, but many passages of those lectures affected me like poems, impressing themselves so instantly and permanently on

the mind that, when I now open the book, I seem to know them by heart. Such were the passages, in the first lecture on Presbyterianism, in the second on martyrdom in connexion with the Covenanters, in the third on Robert Burns. I can still see the poise of the speaker's head, the movement of his features, and hear the tones of his voice, as he pronounced such memorable utterances. All the apparent indifference which too commonly clung to his manner was gone; his mind was energizing with perfect freedom; and his sallies went straight as an arrow to the mark. It seemed to be the very genius of his country that was uttering itself through him—or rather the genius of the Christian portion of his countrymen; for he took his stand uncompromisingly on the most Christian ground and identified himself with Evangelical principles. Of course these lectures are too brief to give by themselves anything like a complete account of Scottish Church History; but, if read along with a work containing the facts, they would supply the essence or soul, which is too often lacking in more pretentious performances.

From what had appeared to be his natural and providential career Rainy was drawn away by the attraction of ecclesiastical politics. I have frequently heard him narrate the circumstances in which this change in the course of his life began. At a crisis of the history of his Church he had been urged to write a pamphlet; one of his colleagues in the New College dissuaded him, warning him that, if once he touched the edge of this maelstrom, he would never get out of the current; but necessity was laid upon him, and he had to yield. The result was as had been predicted. Thenceforth the door of his study was to a great extent shut against him; instead of writing learned books, he was incessantly occupied with reports, minutes and the other para-



phernalia of ecclesiastical courts. He had to persuade men, to secure majorities, to smooth differences and soothe susceptibilities. He was not unaware how much he was sacrificing, and he was not without qualms of conscience. But, on the whole, he would have answered in the words of Alexander Henderson—a churchman whom he strongly resembled—“When, from a sense of myself and my own thoughts and ways, I begin to remember how men who love to live obscurely and in the shadow are brought forth to light, to the view and talking of the world; how men who love quietness are made to stir and to have a hand in public business; how men that love soliloquies and contemplations are brought upon debates and controversies; and, generally, how men are brought to act the things which they never determined nor so much as dreamed of before; the words of the prophet Jeremiah come to my remembrance: ‘O Lord, I know that the way of man is not in himself.’” It is impossible not to wish sometimes that it had been otherwise; yet, as has been frequently remarked, it is a greater thing to be a maker than a writer of history; and it was to the making of history that he was now called.

For this rôle also he had eminent qualifications.

He was not, indeed, an orator. In the obituary notice in the *Spectator* he was compared in this respect with Mr. Gladstone. But a more misleading comparison could hardly have been made; for, whereas in his very simplest utterances Mr. Gladstone was invariably the orator, Dr. Rainy’s speaking, even on the greatest occasions, lacked this special quality. Of this he was well aware; and I recall a remarkable saying of his on this peculiar gift. “I have heard,” he said, “all the great speakers of my time, in both Church and State, but, after hearing Chalmers, I could not call one of them eloquent.”

In another obituary notice he is praised for encouraging

younger colleagues : " He consulted them, he drew them out, he treated them as equals." This, however, is written only from the ideal of an ecclesiastical leader in the writer's mind, not from the facts. Dr. Rainy accepted those who offered themselves and worked heartily with them ; but he was deficient in the art of drawing out the hesitating and making opportunities for beginners. Once, in the rashness of youth, I ventured to remonstrate with him against appearing too often on the platform with an inferior practitioner, thereby giving the enemy occasion to blaspheme ; but he kindled up at once, saying : " That man does what is done by very few : he puts his shoulder every time, and all the time, beneath the public burden : and that is enough for me."

He exhibited, indeed, extraordinary patience in working with those who thus in Providence were made his fellow-workers. Often have I seen him in committee produce a draft of what he proposed as the deliverance on an important case ; and, as what he had written seemed to me to be perfect, I was annoyed beyond measure at the alterations insisted on by others. But he would alter words, clauses and whole sentences, till there was hardly anything left of what he had submitted, without betraying the least dissatisfaction ; and it was manifestly his reverence for the rights of others that made him so tolerant.

The charge oftenest brought against him was an excess of pliancy—a dexterity in breaking down opposition and securing majorities. But, as Professor Masson pointed out on a memorable occasion, it belongs to a position like that occupied by him to be " a master of expedencies " ; and love and humility may be the moving springs of such a habit rather than craft or ambition. The only occasion I can remember when he seemed to me to be putting a strain on his own conscience was at a private meeting the evening

before the Free Church finally decided to unite with the United Presbyterians, when he agreed to accept verbatim a statement from the leading man amongst the objectors ; and next day, when it turned out that this had been entirely in vain, he lost for once the temper over which he maintained so unfailing a control, pouring on the man whom he had tried to secure such scathing words of disdain as will never be forgotten by any who heard them.

He seemed always to have powers in reserve. One of these resources of which he made very rare use was humour. But more than once, when a serious argument would have been dangerous, I have seen him simply blow a disagreeable question out of the window with a blast of the most irresistible fun. In private he relished a good story, and he could tell one too with the best.

But what told most of all in his work as a public man was an impression he produced of wisdom. Not infrequently his speeches were tedious and circumlocutionary ; they must have been the despair of reporters ; plain people, reading them, could not follow or make out what he was at ; but somewhere there would be, before the speech was done, a sentence which settled the question ; and the General Assembly, which he held in the hollow of his hand, would wait with Scots stolidity and patience till this sentence came, and would then go away perfectly happy and satisfied. As he sank into his most indifferent mood, I have often thought how difficult it would be for a foreigner to understand the secret of his power. But on occasions when a strong stimulus was applied, he was transfigured ; and, such a stimulus being applied continuously during the last two years of his life, his speaking was superb. It was finer than it had ever been ; and remarkable it was to see a man of eighty covering the whole ground, touching every point, and enfolding the whole subject in the fervour of a radiant faith.

For the total result of his services as a Church leader different formulae would be used by different observers. It might be said, for example, that he was the man who induced the Free Church to abandon the attitude of hoping for a return to the Establishment and to accept the attitude of seeking Presbyterian union outside the State Connexion. When he first came to the front, the Church was about equally divided ; but he wore the opposition down, till only a rump was left, in which, however, there still proved to be a sting ; and the Church united with a body to which separation from the State was, if not formally, yet practically, a matter of faith. Another formula which would cover a great deal would be to say that his task was to hold together, as one whole, a Church composed of very heterogeneous elements. The Free Church comprised North and South, Highlander and Lowlander, the inhabitants of the Islands and the inhabitants of the great cities. It was always difficult to get such various companies to keep step. Some tended to advance too fast, others to progress too slowly. His task was to restrain the forwards and encourage the laggards, and keep the line as straight and even as he was able. He was successful till 1892, when the minute secession of the Free Presbyterians took place ; and then, at the Union, in 1900, occurred the second breach, the dimensions of which are still to be ascertained. Within one or other of these two formulae most of his career could be embraced ; but of course there was a great deal of miscellaneous work not easily brought within any formula. It turned up incidentally from time to time, and a leader had to do the best he could with it, without conscious reference to any programme of his own, though no doubt his policy was in conscious or unconscious harmony with his underlying principles.

By the movement in favour of the use of hymns in public worship and by that in favour of organs he snapped the



strings of custom and set his Church free for development. Still more was this the case with the Declaratory Act of 1892, by which tender consciences were relieved from the strain of the more questionable portions of the Confession of Faith. Although, as has been mentioned, this occasioned a secession, Dr. Rainy used to say that no act of his life gave him more unalloyed satisfaction.

The first great movement in which he was engaged was that for union with the United Presbyterians. The first negotiations ended in failure, or rather postponement ; and I have often wished to know by whose advice the advance was suspended. I suspect it was by Dr. Rainy's ; for I do not believe that the hot spirit of Candlish could have dictated such a surrender. I doubt also whether Dr. Rainy would have himself moved in the resumption of the negotiations, had not the United Presbyterian Synod forced his hand. For welcoming the invitation from that quarter Dr. Ross Taylor deserves more credit than he receives. But, when Dr. Rainy at last committed himself, he threw all his business talents into the negotiations ; and he deservedly became the figurehead of the Union.

After the dropping of the first union negotiations, Principal Cairns, of the United Presbyterian Church, and Principal Rainy threw themselves together into the movement for Disestablishment ; and it was their hope that the Church would be disestablished before it was necessary to resume union negotiations, and then the disestablished Church of Scotland could be included in the union. At one time it seemed as if their object was well within their grasp, Mr. Gladstone being apparently on the point of disestablishing the Scottish Church. But there is many a slip between the cup and the lip ; and at the critical moment Mr. Gladstone's energies became directed to the absorbing subject of Irish politics. In connexion with the Disestablishment

campaign Dr. Rainy encountered extraordinary odium from opponents ; he was indifferently supported in his own Church ; and not a few severe losses were sustained, when those who took up the cause of Anti-Home Rule with something like religious fervour adopted the notion that he had sold his support of Mr. Gladstone's Irish policy as a *quid-pro-quo* for disestablishment. Never, however, was there a more baseless belief. From first to last Dr. Rainy was acting on a profound conviction of his own, not only that a reunion of Scottish Presbyterianism on a large scale is impossible except outside of the State Connection, but also that State support for Churches is an expedient which belongs to the past. He did not take the trouble to decide whether it had ever been lawful and advantageous : that is to say, he was not a theoretic Voluntary ; but, at all events, at the stage which the Christian Church has reached in Scotland, he considered it an impediment and not a help.

The second formula mentioned above, as embracing the work of Dr. Rainy as a Church-leader, received its fullest illustration in the cases brought before the Church Courts through the development in Scotland of the Higher Criticism. The instinct which guided him through these perplexing processes was the desire to keep the Church together. It carried him too far when it led him to propose the removal of Professor Robertson Smith from the Chair of Hebrew at Aberdeen without a formal conviction ; but the temptation was strong ; for the alarm which had broken out in the country, and especially in the Highlands, was genuine and profound. For many reasons it would have been far easier for him to commit himself without reserve to the progressive party. He said to me at the time, that he knew he was risking his whole career by letting the young Free Church look upon him as an enemy. But it was

the main current of his life which was carrying him forward. At heart he was in sympathy with progress ; but his belief was that there would not have been a Free Church to make progress in, if he had not for the moment given way. He nobly redeemed afterwards his pledges to the cause of freedom when he carried Professor George Adam Smith triumphantly through a similar trial. Only he had to incur the charge of inconsistency, which it was easy to bring against one who recommended in the one case the views he had resisted in the other.

Never did Dr. Rainy show to less advantage than in the Robertson Smith debates. In those days he often appeared to me like a man fighting with one of his hands bandaged to his side, or like a boy who, having resolved not to fight, allows the other combatant to batter him at pleasure. And his antagonist did not fail to take advantage of his opportunity. It was pitiable in those days to see how the leaders of the Church, shying at the merits of the question, which they did not understand, rode away on points of order and procedure. Rainy knew perfectly well what the real issue was ; but of course he was an outsider in comparison with an expert like Robertson Smith. A most interesting memorial of the exercise of his mind on this subject will be found in a small book, entitled *The Bible and Criticism*, being four lectures delivered in 1878 at the Presbyterian College, London ; and a perusal of this work will lead, if I am not mistaken, to the conclusion that Criticism, as a scientific method of dealing with certain phenomena of the Holy Scriptures, had thoroughly penetrated his mind and won from him the recognition of its legitimacy as one of the functions of a Church, but that Criticism, in the sense of a body of opinions which critics at present hold with so much consent among themselves as to demand for it the assent of the Church

also, had but faintly touched him, and had in no degree altered his attitude to the Bible.

When, on August 1, 1904, the decision of the House of Lords on the Church Case fell like a bolt from the blue, many at once exclaimed that this would be the end of Principal Rainy. On the contrary, however, it proved to be the signal for the most remarkable phase of his entire career. That which staggered younger men exhilarated him and summoned forth all his latent capacities, while his religious faith rose buoyantly to meet the crisis. His appeal to the country against manifest and crying injustice made the intervention of Parliament inevitable; and his personal exertions in London transmogrified the Bill of the Lord Advocate. The late Samuel Smith, an old parliamentary hand, expressed to me the opinion that the securing of the Act in the circumstances was the most remarkable parliamentary achievement he had ever witnessed. Advantage was taken of the juncture to pass in the Church Courts a declaration of spiritual independence more unmis-takeable than had ever been formulated before; and it was in full view of this that the restoration of property was made. As the country saw the old man encountering disaster with such cheerfulness and tranquillity, and fighting his way through it with such resolution, sympathy and enthusiasm rose to salute the heroic figure, and even the tongues of enemies could not withhold their tribute of admiration.

For a lifetime Dr. Rainy had excited the keenest opposition, very real on the part of those who believed their interests to be endangered by his policy, largely histrionic on the part of the secular press. But from the first he was surrounded by a body of zealous adherents who understood and appreciated him. And this body steadily grew, its love being only stimulated by the attacks of the press. It received a large accession at the period of the Union, the



United Presbyterians acquiring as high an esteem for him as those of his own Church. What these came to see and appreciate was the religious character of the man. It has never been difficult for churches to get men of ability to love and serve them, when these have been rewarded with the honours and prizes which a Church is able to offer ; but such men have not infrequently been inferior characters, sustained in their exertions by motives far from exalted. Rainy, on the contrary, loved his Church for the amount and the quality of the saintliness it contained, and his constant aim was to make it a better instrument for the salvation of men. He knew all the heights and depths of religious experience ; and this kept him simple and humble, when circumstances might have rendered him the reverse. In his Lectures on the Scottish Church in reply to Dean Stanley he laid down as one of the conditions of the life and power of the Scottish Churches “ the common conception prevailing and cherished among us of what conversion is, what the divine life in the soul of man is ” ; and anyone who reads his exposition of this theme, in the Third Lecture, may learn for himself what was the essential conviction of the man who wrote it. Of Alexander Henderson history records that, when Moderator of the Glasgow Assembly of 1638, he devoted the intervals that could be snatched from business to conversation with those in spiritual anxiety, and to Dr. Rainy this would at any time have been a congenial transition. Twice he interrupted his ordinary course, when Mr. Moody, the American evangelist, was in Edinburgh, in order to speak to his students, who listened with breathless attention, on the necessity of conversion and on the place of revivals in religion. Now and then, when expected at public meetings to speak on ecclesiastical politics, he would diverge to the *interiora* of Christian experience. Once, when he did so in the General Assembly

an elder remarked to a friend of mine : “ I am from the North, and you know what I have been taught there to think of Dr. Rainy ; but I have discovered for myself this day that he is a great man of God ; and I am ashamed of the falsehoods I have believed about him.” On occasions of bereavement he would unexpectedly write with his own hand long letters of sympathy, in which he showed familiarity with the deepest secrets of the soul. In such a letter he mentioned that his wife and he had lost an infant in their early married life at Huntly ; and he used, he added, to lie awake on wintry nights and think how incongruous it was that they should be lying so warm and comfortable, while the little one, out there in the darkness, was pelted with the rain or the snow. When, in his later days, he spoke of “ the Lord ”—his favourite name for the Saviour—it was with a tremble in his voice which betrayed how his heart was affected at the very mention of the word. In recent years his commonest thought was the “ wonder ” of the Christian life—that God should think of creatures like us at all, and that His thoughts about us should be so lofty and glorious in Christ.

The truth is, that, though we naturally wish to vindicate the modernness of Principal Rainy, he cannot be understood at all without the recognition in him of something antique. He was old enough at the Disruption to drink in deeply the spirit of that event, and both among his own kindred and in the city of Edinburgh he lived at the very centre of the profound piety generated at that epoch. Not only had there entered into him the greatness of the Disruption, but also its limitations. He was extremely Scottish, very little cosmopolitan ; indeed, till quite recently he was little known outside the bounds of his own country. For him Scotland was enough, and the Free Church was enough. In later life his sympathies expanded, and a wider world began to have some knowledge of him ;

but it will be by his own fellow-countrymen that his memory will be cherished ; and these will number him among a select and chosen few who have illustrated most perfectly what all Scotsmen would desire to be, and have served most wisely, faithfully and unselfishly the highest interests of their native land.

JAMES STALKER.

### SONS OF THUNDER.

AMONGST the unsolved problems of the Gospel, both in the text and in the interpretation, I reckon few more perplexing than the determination of the meaning of the name which our Lord bestowed upon the sons of Zebedee, and the decision of the form in which the name ought to be presented. It is not easy to see how *Boanerges* can be a transliteration of a Hebrew or Aramaic title ; nor, if the transliteration can be restored to its original form, so as to give something which will justify Mark's translation, can we explain, without undue subtlety of exegesis, why the name was bestowed upon the two disciples to whom it is assigned in the Second Gospel. I should myself assume at once that the mysterious name was in error somewhere, both in its consonants and in its vocalization : for how can *Boane-* be the equivalent of *Sons of-*, without an extraordinary looseness of vocalic transcription ? nor can the Semitic consonants which underlie the last half of the word *-rges* be a correct transcription of any word which honestly means *thunder*. Dalman, in his *Grammatik des Jüdisch-Palästinischen Aramäisch* (p. 112), explains the word as follows : First, he assumes that the final letter in *Boavnpγés* is a replacement of a Greek ζ, just as we find in the early MSS. of the New Testament the form *Boés* for the ancestor of King David. Then he regards the first vowel in the word as displaced, and re-writes the title

as

*Bavnpoyés.*

We have now a reasonable ground for assuming this to be the equivalent of an Aramaic or Hebrew

בני רוגז

The next step is more difficult : Dalman has to show that the second of the pair of Hebrew words may mean *thunder*. He does this by appealing to Job xxxvii. 2, where the word occurs and where Job is exhorted by Elihu to listen attentively to the anger of the voice of God, which the LXX. present, with a fairly close transcription, as follows :—

Ακουε, Ἰώβ, ἀκοήν ἐν ὀργῇ θυμοῦ κυρίου,

but which Luther, more poetically, translates by

*Lieber, höre doch, wie sein Donner zürnet.*

But what we want is not the vivid translation of a poetical mind, but the justification of a prosy person in rendering the vocable *-porγés* and the underlying Semitic consonants by the word *thunder*. Dalman's instance is not sufficient to justify such a rendering in a prose document like the Gospel of Mark. And I suspect that he was not quite satisfied with it, since he returns to the question in another note (p. 158), and there, after restating his solution briefly, records that Jerome had in his *Interpretation of Hebrew Names* given another solution. Jerome's explanation is in the following direction : Assume the final sibilant to be the Hebrew ס, and that this is a misreading of a final Hebrew <sup>1</sup> ט; then, observing the constant transcription of the Hebrew ט by the Greek γ, we have a Hebrew original which Jerome gives in the form *banereem* = filii tonitruī ; i.e. the Hebrew original is בְּנֵי רָעַם for בְּנֵי רָגַם.

Dr. Swete, in his commentary on the passage of Mark, while pointing out that there are one or two cursive

<sup>1</sup> We get a similar confusion in Hegesippus' account of St. James the Just, whom he calls Oblias, i.e. περισχὴ τοῦ λαοῦ, where the final letter in Oblias must clearly be an *m* (λαός = עַם).



MSS. which seem to favour Dalman's restoration, is careful to remark that the proper word for *thunder* in Hebrew and Syriac is רעם, and that there is no assistance to be obtained from the Syriac language for other suggested forms. But he still seems to think that some light might be obtained from the speech of Elihu to Job, which, I must say, frankly, appears to me to be highly improbable. As far, then, as the textual problem goes, there is evidence for belief that we have a very ancient error somewhere, and, on the whole, Jerome seems to be nearer to the true solution than Dalman.

As for the interpretations of the Name, when a form has been found for which *Sons of Thunder* is a lawful translation, the common explanations are mere afterthoughts; the name is read in the light of the incidents in the Gospel which betray "a natural impetuosity of character"; (so Swete, referring to Mark ix. 38, Luke ix. 54;) or else referred to the prominence which the two brethren were to have in the new order. Over these exegetical attempts to justify the title, it is not necessary to occupy our attention longer at present; our path lies in another direction.

It should be remembered, before we proceed to the elucidation of the Boanerges riddle, that whatever may be the correct spelling, it is certain that the spelling as we have it is of the highest antiquity. The text of Mark iii. 17 reads as follows:—

καὶ Ἰάκωβον τὸν τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ Ἰακώβου καὶ ἐπέθηκεν αὐτοῖς ὄνομα Βοανηργές, ὃ ἐστὶν Υἱοὶ Βροντῆς.

Now, although this does not appear in the Synoptic parallels of Matthew and Luke, it must be a touch of the highest antiquity, whose very obscurity would be sufficient to explain its omission by the later Evangelists. But, if it does not appear in Matthew and Luke, it appears again in an even more perplexing form in the Dialogue of Justin

with Trypho the Jew, where it appears to be taken from the Memoirs of Peter, and to be regarded as a fulfilment of prophecy.

Justin uses the incident of the re-naming of the Apostles by the Lord to show the parallelism of such a proceeding with the changes of names of famous Old Testament characters, and to draw from the parallel a conclusion as to the nature and authority of Christ. Accordingly, he says (*Dial.* 106) :—

καὶ τὸ εἰπεῖν μετωνομακῆναι αὐτὸν Πέτρον ἕνα τῶν ἀποστόλων, καὶ γέγραφθαι ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασιν αὐτοῦ γεγενημένον καὶ τοῦτο, μετὰ τοῦ καὶ ἄλλους δύο ἀδελφούς, υἱὸς Ζεβεδαίου ὄντας, μετωνομακῆναι ὀνόματι τοῦ Βοανεργῆς, ὃ ἐστὶν υἱὸς βροντῆς, σημαντικὸν ἦν κτέ.

Here we have the conjunction between the re-naming of Peter and the Sons of Zebedee, in close agreement with Mark, and an apparent reference to Peter's Memoirs, which has not unnaturally led to the belief that we had here the earliest reference to Mark's Gospel. Moreover, if, as we have shown to be likely, Boanerges is a corrupt form, then the probability that Justin is quoting from Mark is much increased. Only we must remember that the admission of the quotation would not add anything to the explanation of the word : it would show us over again that we are dealing with very early matter ; but this would be equally the case if Justin were quoting from Peter's Memoirs and not from Mark. (I note, in passing, that the slight variation in spelling between Justin's form and Mark's suggests, in a shadowy way, that there has been no assimilation of Justin's text to that of the second Gospel.)

And now for our suggestion as to the meaning of the term Boanerges. It is not exactly a theological suggestion, and it is not, strictly speaking, my own. It comes from the side of Anthropology and from Dr. J. G. Frazer, who drew my attention to it some time since, and who now

recommends me to publish it. The suggestion, a perfectly obvious one when once it is made, is that we have in the "Sons of Thunder" a title of the Dioscuri or Heavenly Twins, and that the name has been bestowed upon the two brethren because of twin-like features in their appearance or conduct.

The common name for the Heavenly Twins in the Greek world is Dioscuri, or Children of Zeus; and it is well known that the name of Zeus is derived from an Aryan word for the Sky, probably the bright sky. Hence, in the first instance, the European God was a Sky-god, and the Heavenly Twins were his sons and assessors. An interesting case of a parallel development of religious thought has been pointed out by me<sup>1</sup> from the Baronga tribes of S.E. Africa, who pay especial honour to twin-births, and give to the children the name of Bana-ba-Tilo, or Children of Tilo, the word Tilo being the Baronga equivalent of Sky. We may say, then, that we have an exact parallel to the genesis of the cult of Zeus, the Sky-god, and the Dioscuri. We may state the case in the words of M. Junod, a missionary among the Baronga, who explains the matter thus :

Cette puissance, qui produit l'éclair et la mort, préside aussi d'une manière toute spéciale à la naissance des jumeaux, à tel point que la femme qui les a mis au monde est appelée du nom de Tilo, Ciel, et les enfants eux-mêmes : Bana-ba-Tilo, enfants du Ciel.

Here, then, we have the Greek idea of Children of the Sky, with an accentuation of the term Sky in the direction of *Lightning* and Death. How slight a space separates, then, the conception of the Children of the Sky from the Sons of Thunder.

And the farther back we go into the history of savage peoples the more closely do the Sky and the Thunder and

<sup>1</sup> *Cult of the Heavenly Twins*, pp. 19, 27.

Lightning approach together, and the Sky-god and the Thunder-god appear to be equivalent. We are accustomed to recognize in the Zeus of mythology the figure of the Thunderer; but no one knows, until he examines the matter carefully, how absolutely identical the Sky-god and the Thunder-god can be. Indeed, we constantly find amongst savage peoples that the very same word does duty both for Sky and Thunder. Here is a single instance from Ellis' account of the Yoruba-speaking tribes of West Africa (p. 35):—

Tshis and Gàs use the words Nyankupon and 'Nyonmo to express sky, rain, or thunder and lightning.

Thus the philology of savage languages comes to our aid when we point out that the Children of the Sky and the Sons of Thunder are adjacent and almost equivalent ideas.

Those who wish to see the case for the European Sky-god splendidly worked out, should consult a series of articles by Mr. A. B. Cook, which appeared in the journal *Folklore* for the last two years. Here we shall find the complete proof that our own ancestors worshipped a god who was by turns (and perhaps at once) a god of the Sky, a god of the Thunder, and a god of the Oak.

But I must not diverge into this region at present: enough has been said to present the statement that the Sons of Thunder in the Gospel of Mark are the Dioscuri, in some form or other of their varied presentation in the cults of the Mediterranean. And it follows, from this explanation, that Dioscuric ideas must have been prevalent in Palestine at the beginning of the Christian era.

We are now relieved of any artificial explanations as to why the two brethren came to receive the perplexing name. We do not need, for instance, to argue, with Dr. Swete, that James, the brother of John, was probably a forcible



person, who owed his martyrdom to his vigorous denunciations ; nor need we search the writings attributed to St. John for *νοητὴ βροντὴ*, with Origen. For, if the name was really given them by our Lord, it was given them at an early period, and not exactly for literary reasons, however true it may be that a forcible man lies behind a forcible book. The real reason for the name must lie in the fact that they were twins, or that they looked like them, or that they acted in some way as the Dioscuri were reckoned to act. We are at least sure that they were brothers, and there are not wanting cases in which they behave in a Dioscuric manner, the most striking being the attempt (Luke ix. 54) to avenge a case of inhospitality on the part of a Samaritan village by fire from heaven, where we notice that the common reference to Elijah, as the person whose conduct was imitated, does not appear to belong to the original text. But the examination of such points is difficult, and it takes one into a good many obscure paths, which, for the present, we are hardly prepared to traverse. So we content ourselves with the suggested explanation of Boanerges which Dr. Frazer has made, and with the corollary that, if it is correct, the proof of the existence of Dioscuric ideas in Palestine in our Lord's time appears to be conclusive.

J. RENDEL HARRIS.

*THE LIFE OF CHRIST ACCORDING TO ST.  
MARK.*<sup>1</sup>

LI. THE THREEFOLD MOCKING, XV. 29-32.<sup>2</sup>

THE agony and shame of a malefactor were a welcome public spectacle ; and the crowd gathered to witness the execution, jeered at the would-be Messiah, whose sufferings seemed a clear proof of imposture. They had heard that He had promised to destroy the Temple and build it again in three days. Surely then He could release Himself from the cross ; or, at any rate, God would release Him. Passers-by wagged their heads at Him and shouted—

“ Oh, thou destroyer of the Temple, who art to build it again in three days, save thyself, and come down from the cross.”

They spoke indeed with some lingering remnant of apprehension—suppose even now He were to come down from the cross. It was not too late for some terrible portent of Divine judgment. Standing at some distance, a group of women who had followed Jesus from Galilee<sup>3</sup> watched the scene, not without a corresponding hope—faint and desperate—of deliverance.

Priests and scribes were there, making sure that the sentence was actually carried out, and that their victim did not escape them at the last moment. They were too dignified to join the common people in noisy derision, but amongst themselves they spoke in contemptuous scorn :—

“ He saved others, but himself he cannot save. Let

<sup>1</sup> These studies do not profess to be an adequate historical or dogmatic account of Christ ; they simply attempt to state the impression which the Second Gospel would make upon a reader who had no other sources of information as to Jesus, and was unacquainted with Christian doctrine.

<sup>2</sup> Verse 28 does not seem to have belonged to the original text ; it was perhaps introduced from Luke xxii. 37.

<sup>3</sup> Mark xv. 40, 41.

this Messiah, this King of Israel, come down now from the cross, that we may see and believe.”

They also spoke not without a dim, lurking apprehension that He might indeed come down ; and some quieted an uneasy conscience with the thought that after all they were only putting Jesus to a final test. If He were indeed the Messiah, God would deliver Him. If God left Him to die, clearly He must be an impostor.

His companions in misfortune joined in the general scoffing. They, too, had thought that deliverance might come to this crucified Messiah, and that they might be rescued with Him. Disappointment aroused a sense of injury.

## LII. THE DEATH OF JESUS, XV. 33-41.

As time went on the spectacle lost its novelty ; at that busy season men had little leisure, and there was much to distract their attention ; the crowd thinned, and the jeers became fewer. Now and then men passed by, coming and going from the crowded city, and paused for a while to look on ; there were new outbursts of derision. Throughout it all the guards remained about the crosses, and the women stood aloof to watch. Nothing else happened ; God did not rescue Jesus ; there was no sign on earth or in heaven. No voice from on high reached His ear ; no message of Divine comfort came to His heart. Pain tortured His body ; the sense of public disgrace and conspicuous failure crushed His spirit ; and the slow hours passed by and brought no relief.

Noon came and went, and the hope of deliverance waned and disappeared. When the followers of Jesus, especially the women who were spectators, recalled this terrible interval in after years, it seemed as if midnight had fallen in those noontide hours. It mattered not whether the sky

was bright or overcast ; for them the light of life was quenched, " Darkness fell over the whole earth."

About the middle of the afternoon, Jesus broke His long silence ; a wild cry rang from the cross :—

ELI, ELI, LAMA SABACHTHANI.

" My God ! My God ! Why hast thou forsaken me ? "

To the women these words were a confirmation of their despair.

But some of the bystanders, hearing imperfectly, thought that He called for Elijah, the forerunner of the Messiah. Who could tell what might follow this awful call ?

Even now, when the life of Jesus was almost spent, the prophet who brought down fire from heaven might appear, swift and terrible, to deliver the Messiah, and execute vengeance on His enemies. Moved by an unknown impulse, perhaps by the desire to be found ministering to the Messiah in case Elijah came, one of the spectators filled a sponge with vinegar, put it on the end of a reed, and put it to the lips of Jesus that He might drink. The guard would have stopped him, but he pleaded—

" Let me alone, let us see whether Elijah is coming to take Him down."

And they waited to see ; the heavens did not open to let Elijah come in his chariot of fire ; but their suspense was soon ended ; the expectant silence was broken by another terrible cry from the cross ; and when they looked they saw that Jesus was dead.

Thus the shrine in which the Blessed Spirit of Jesus had lodged was dismantled, and left empty of its Guest ; the veil of the temple was rent asunder, and the Divine Presence departed. But even in its departing, neither pain, nor despair, nor public shame, nor the clutching hands of death could wholly obscure the glory of that Presence.



The last moments of Jesus wrung a testimony to Himself from a heathen spectator. The centurion in command of the guard stood opposite Jesus watching Him ; as he heard His last utterance and saw His end, he exclaimed—

“Certainly this man was a son of God.”

#### LIII. THE BURIAL, XV. 42-46.

The day drew on towards its close ; the dead body was left hanging on the cross ; and the women still watched. Some one, however, took the news of the death of Jesus into the city. His friends were anxious that His body should be rescued from the indignity of public exposure ; and if anything were to be done, it must be done at once. In an hour or two the sun would set, the Sabbath would begin, and no respectable Jew would help to take the body down from the cross. If it were not removed now, it must hang till the Sabbath was over. The Apostles had either disappeared or did not dare to take the risk of interfering, and the dangerous task was left for one who had been less intimately associated with the Master, a certain Joseph of Arimathea, a man of position, and a member of the Sanhedrim. Apparently, he was not actually a disciple, for we are simply told that he was “one of those who looked for the Kingdom of God.” Such a man might not see his way to the formal acceptance of Jesus as Messiah, and yet might be full of love and reverence towards Him, and greatly moved to indignation and pity by His crucifixion. He plucked up courage, obtained audience of Pilate, and begged for the body of Jesus.

Pilate, as we have seen, had no feeling against Jesus, and had no objection to His being honourably buried ; but on other grounds he hesitated to grant this request. Sometimes a similar permission had been granted a little prematurely ; it had turned out that the criminal had not

actually expired, and his friends had taken down a man supposed to be dead and had succeeded in restoring him to life. Crucifixion was a lingering death, and Jesus had succumbed long before the usual time. Was He really dead? Pilate sent for the centurion, and questioned him as to the time of death. When he had satisfied himself that Jesus was certainly dead, he gave Joseph permission to bury the corpse.

Joseph bought a linen cloth, and having procured assistance, went to the place of crucifixion, took down the body and wrapped it in the cloth. Then he had it carried away, and placed in a tomb hewn in the rock. They closed the opening by rolling a heavy boulder against it.

#### LIV. THE WOMEN AT THE TOMB, XV. 47-XVI. 8.

All this was done hurriedly, that it might be finished in the short interval that remained before the beginning of the Sabbath. It was not the full and final burial, but only a temporary disposing of the body. Those who loved Jesus would wish to supplement these maimed rites; and it was perhaps intended to remove the body later on to some other grave. Two of the women had followed, and marked where the body was laid. A little later the sun set; it was the Sabbath, and nothing more could be done. But when another evening had come and the Sabbath was over, three of the women bought spices with which to anoint the body. It was too dark to go that evening, but they set out the first thing the next morning, with the earliest glimmer of light, and reached the grave soon after sunrise. Hitherto they had been too absorbed in their beloved Master to think of anything else, but as they drew near they remembered the huge boulder that blocked the entrance. Who would roll it away for them? What were they to do?

When they looked, however, they saw that the entrance

was clear, and the grave was empty—at least so it seemed ; but they ventured in, and saw a youth in white sitting on the right hand. As they stood, speechless with astonishment, the youth said,—

“Do not be astonished, you are looking for Jesus of Nazareth, who was crucified. He has risen, he is not here. Behold the place where they laid him ; but go and tell his disciples, and tell Peter, ‘He is going before you into Galilee. There shall ye see him, as he told you.’”

But when the women recovered from the first shock of surprise, the removal of the boulder and the absence of the body suggested to them some awful happening, and they saw in the youth a visitant from another world. Half mad with fear, trembling in every limb, they made their way out of the cave as best they could, and fled, too frightened to tell any one what they had seen and heard.<sup>1</sup>

\* \* \* \* \*

*Here the narrative breaks off abruptly, probably through the accidental loss of concluding paragraphs. We may imagine the reader whose impressions we have tried to put into words learning that in the course of centuries the followers of Jesus formed societies spread over almost the whole world, embracing a large proportion of the human race and controlling powerful states ; learning in short that the personality of Jesus became the greatest influence in the world. He would be eager to discover the solution of the problem how all this had been the sequel of the Cross and the empty tomb.*

W. H. BENNETT.

<sup>1</sup> Verses 9-20 were not part of the original text.

### THE AGONY IN THE GARDEN.

(1) THE *Kenosis* or humiliation of the Son of God embraced His whole personality ; it was shown in His mind by the limitation of His knowledge (*Study XII.*) ; in His will by His liability to temptation (*Study V.*) ; in His heart by His subjection to varying emotions. Again and again during the course of His ministry He experienced struggles of soul. A few instances may be given. In working the miracles He was inwardly distracted by on the one hand His anxiety not to encourage an idle curiosity (John iv. 48), and on the other His impulse to relieve need and suffering (Matt. xiv. 14, xv. 32, xx. 34 ; Mark i. 41 ; Luke vii. 13). His compassion for the multitude was in conflict with His desire to prepare His disciples for their work (Matt. ix. 30 ; Mark i. 44, vi. 31). The unbelief which hindered Him in the works of healing to which His pity moved Him deeply distressed Him (Matt. xiii. 58). The case of the man who "was deaf, and had an impediment in his speech," presents several interesting features. The sufferer is taken away from the crowd ; the deaf ears are touched by the fingers of Jesus ; the impeded tongue is anointed with His spittle. Only after the prayer of the heavenward look and the *sigh* revealing inward strain, is the word of cure, *Ephphatha*, spoken (Mark vii. 34). Was this unbelief of the sufferer so resistant that Jesus feared that the miracle would be hindered ; or did He dread a revival of the popularity from which He was anxious to escape ? The unbelief which tormented Him with the demand for a *sign* drew from Him a deep sigh (*ἀναστενάξας τῷ πνεύματι*, Mark viii. 12). At the grave of Lazarus His feelings seem to have been still more deeply

stirred. Both the dead brother and the sorrowing sisters were very dear to Him ; He felt very keen sympathy with their grief. The helplessness of their sorrow made Him still more sorrowful. The distrust of His power that even the sisters showed, and the unbelief of the mourners who were with them, caused Him intense distress. "He groaned in the spirit and was troubled" (John xi. 33), "He wept" (v. 35), and He, "groaning in Himself, cometh to the tomb" (v. 38). His vain striving to save Jerusalem from its doom so grieved His heart that He wept over it (Luke xix. 41). According to the *Fourth Gospel* (xii. 27) the request of the Greeks to see Him drew from Him the confession, "now is My soul troubled." (The connexion of this passage with the Synoptic record of Gethsemane was mentioned in the last *Study*, and will be again referred to in this.) The controversies in which He was engaged, the temptations to which He was exposed, the disappointments He experienced both from His relatives and His disciples, all affected Him with many varying emotions.

(2) It is in the record of the Agony in the Garden, however, that His complete humanity in its full participation in human emotions is revealed. It was after *His Last Supper* with His disciples that He withdrew to the garden to prepare Himself for the arrest, the trial, and the death which in a few hours awaited Him. In the Upper Room He was troubled by the presence of the traitor ; the warning of treachery given to the other disciples was a last appeal to the traitor himself from the loving heart of Jesus, torn with grief and dread of the doom awaiting him (Matt. xxvi. 24), and was enforced by the token of affection in the sop offered to him (John xiii. 26) ; the striving of love having proved vain, the strain of the soul of Jesus could be relieved only by the dismissal of Judas. (The fuller account of the *Fourth*



*Gospel*, xiii. 21–30, is not at all improbable.) As His affection for His disciples had made Jesus eager for this farewell meal with them, so it reinforced His hope of a reunion with them (Luke xxii. 15; Matt. xxvi. 29). Even in full view of death He was confident of the fulfilment of His purpose in the kingdom of God (Luke xxii. 16). Whether the words in Luke xxii. 19, this “do in remembrance of Me,” are borrowed from Paul’s account of the institution of the Supper in 1 Corinthians xi. 24 or not, it seems most fitting that in the hour of parting Jesus should have desired to be remembered by His disciples, probably not in an occasional ordinance divorced from their daily life, as the Lord’s Supper has unhappily come to be, but in all their common meals, so that whenever they sat together the meaning that He gave to His death would be remembered by them. What He most of all wanted His disciples to remember about Himself was His sacrifice. The significance He gave to it was expressed in the symbolism of the ancient ritual, as interpreted by prophetic teaching. As the old covenant at Sinai had been sealed by sacrifice (Exod. xxiv. 8), so the new covenant prophesied by Jeremiah (xxxi 33, 34) and now fulfilled, was being sealed by the sacrifice of His death. The blessings of the New Covenant—the law put in the inward parts and written on the heart, the union of God and man, the universal knowledge of God, the forgiveness of sin—were to be secured—especially the last—by His sacrifice. (The clause in Matthew xxvi. 28, “unto remission of sins,” even if not authentic, is a correct interpretation.) We must always remind ourselves of the truth so emphasized by the writer of the *Epistle to the Hebrews* that the sacrifices of the old covenant could not, “as touching the conscience, make the worshipper perfect, being only carnal ordinances, imposed until a time of reformation” (ix. 9, 10); that these were but “a shadow of the good things to come,

not the very image of the things" (x. 1); and must not, therefore, expect the old covenant ritual to furnish us with the clue to the meaning of the sacrifice of Jesus. While the words at the Supper make clear the aim of His sacrifice—man's redemption from sin and restoration to God—what the sacrifice itself was we can learn only in so far as His own consciousness is revealed to us.

(3) Some light on the mystery of the Cross we may expect from the study of the agony in Gethsemane. From the Upper Room He brought to the garden pity and pain for the traitor, a deep horror for the doom that awaited him, the sorrow of separation from His disciples, relieved by an assurance of reunion, the certainty of establishing by His death the new covenant of God with man, but also the anticipation of all that His death as the sacrifice of the covenant might involve for Himself. He was beginning to realize on His way to Gethsemane what the breaking of His body and the shedding of His blood might cost Him, not in bodily pain, but in soul-anguish. On the way another element in His suffering is confessed. As He looks forward to the Cross, He foresees that even His disciples, overcome by coward fears, will forsake Him. Peter's rash boast makes the warning in his case only the more explicit; he will deny as well as abandon (Matt. xxvi. 31-35).

(4) Thus overwhelmed with griefs and fears He sought to be alone with God, as was His wont in the great *crises of His ministry*. To mention a few instances, the success of the first day of His public ministry in Capernaum seems to have brought Him some uncertainty in regard to His future course, and He withdrew Himself from His disciples to seek divine guidance in prayer (Mark i. 35). As a result of that guidance He entered on a preaching tour in the synagogues of Galilee (v. 38). Moved by His compassion for the leper He touched him (Luke v. 13), but, having thus

exposed Himself to a charge of ceremonial uncleanness, in order that His work might not be on that ground interfered with, He first enjoined secrecy (v. 14); but when His command was disregarded He sought to avoid giving any offence by withdrawal from the multitudes to the desert (v. 16). In this solitude He prayed (v. 16), doubtless for directions as to His next step. After the feeding of the Five Thousand a great danger faced Him: the mistaken enthusiasm of the multitudes, which was probably fully shared by the disciples, sought to force on Him a course contrary to His own consciousness of His vocation (John vi. 15). After constraining the disciples, who would gladly have taken the lead in such a movement, to cross the lake in the boat, and after dismissing the reluctant multitude, He departed into the mountain to pray (Mark vi. 46). May we venture to assume that He prayed not only for strength to resist this temptation, but also for such wisdom in His dealing with the disciples and the multitude that His disappointment of their hopes by His refusal might not hinder His work? So important an event as His choice of the twelve was preceded by prayer "continued all night" (Luke vi. 12). As was shown in the *Last Study*, He sought light on the mystery of His death in prayer, and received an answer in the *Transfiguration* (Luke ix. 28). It was in accord with His constant habit that He sought *solitude with God*. The place to which He withdrew was not unfamiliar to Him, but already hallowed by such intercourse with God. The explanation in the *Fourth Gospel* (xviii. 2, "Now Judas also, which betrayed Him, knew the place; for Jesus oftentimes resorted thither with His disciples") is altogether credible. This circumstance, it may be noted in passing, shows that Jesus was more at home in Jerusalem than the Synoptic records would lead us to believe; and that He had unnamed, yet

devoted, friends who were ready to put at His disposal their property. (Compare the use of the ass, Matthew xxi. 3, and the use of the Upper Room, xxvi. 18.) Although He took all His disciples, save [the traitor, with Him, yet this impulse to solitude compelled Him to leave all but three, probably at the entrance. Even these three, after confiding His sorrow to them, He must leave behind. Feeling the need of human sympathy as He did, yet He was compelled in His prayer to be alone with God (Matt. xxvi. 36-39).

(5) This impulse toward solitude claims closer scrutiny. Does it not reveal to us the truth that loneliness must have been the price paid for His greatness? Not only literally, but figuratively, the Son of Man had not where to lay His head. His own family were so estranged from Him that they sought to hinder His ministry, and He was compelled to disown their right (Matt. xii. 46-50); His disciples, who for a time took the place of mother and brethren, in desire and expectation drifted ever farther from Him; for they would not submit to His choice of the Cross, and were cherishing their ambitions and rivalries (Matt. xviii. 1, xx. 21). The multitudes never understood Him, and thus their abandonment of His cause was not so tragic as the growing estrangement of the disciples. His warm welcome of any word that showed any understanding of His mind and heart (as from the Roman centurion, Matthew viii. 10, and the Syrophœnician mother, Matthew xv. 28), and His generous praise of the token of Mary's affection (Matt. xxvi. 10-12), prove what pain this loneliness was to Him. That one of His disciples had just turned traitor, that another was about to deny Him, that all would forsake Him, intensified His sense of solitude. In Gethsemane He knew Himself to be alone with God in His knowledge of the character and purpose of God, in His judgment on the heinousness



and the hatefulness of human sin, in His apprehension of the dark and drear doom that must follow sin, in His recognition of the ignorance and indifference of men in regard to the most serious issues and the most sacred claims of their life, in His realization of the greatness of the sacrifice which He must Himself offer in order that from all this evil salvation might be secured. This winepress of the mystery and the terror of the sin of man in conflict with the love of God He trod alone, and there was with Him no human helper or comforter. Thus forsaken of man He fled to God. He was alone, yet not alone, for the Father was still with Him (John xvi. 32).

(6) Driven by this *impulse to solitude* Jesus is still held by the *desire for sympathy*. He takes His chosen three companions with Him when He leaves the other disciples behind (Matt. xxvi. 36); when He is withdrawing from them He asks them to watch with Him (v. 38); after His first prayer He comes back to them, and in grieved tones rebukes them for sleeping (v. 40); after the second prayer He again seeks the support of their presence (v. 43); when in His third prayer divine strength is granted Him, He returns to them again, but to tell them that He had sought their help and comfort in vain, and that now He has no need of human succour (v. 45). It is sometimes said that the best love is the love so selfless that it seeks no return, that is content with giving and desires no getting. But is not this a mistake? Love is fellowship of life, and is not completed until the heart loving is also loved. The love of Jesus sought as well as gave. He wanted others to give their life to Him as He gave His to them. Especially in the burden and shadow of His life, when He was going on to His sacrifice, did He seek the response of others to His appeal in sympathy with His sorrow. The welcome which He gave to the tribute of affection from Mary in Bethany



reveals the intensity of His craving. The sympathy she thus showed was her participation in His sacrifice, and gave her deed a place in His Gospel (Matt. xxvi. 12-13). As has already been noted, the disciples had withheld their response to the appeal Jesus had made for sympathy each time He spoke to them of His approaching passion. In Gethsemane Jesus makes His last appeal, and as hitherto in vain. There seem to be two reasons why at this time the desire for sympathy was intensified. On the one hand the will of God was shrouded in mystery for Jesus ; the divine hand was leading Him by a way which He did not understand to a goal from which He shrank ; as will afterwards be shown, He dreaded an interruption of His fellowship with God. On the other hand the sacrifice He anticipated was a vicarious sacrifice ; He was about to taste death for every man, in the pity and grace of His love He was so identifying Himself with mankind, so loving men unto oneness, that the curse on account of sin was to fall on Him in the darkness and desolation of death. Need we wonder that dreading that the Father's face might be hidden from Him, that the burden of man's iniquity would fall upon Him, He yearned deeply that some of the race for the salvation of which He was offering this sacrifice might feel with Him ? Does it not intensify the tragedy of the Cross that mankind left the Saviour alone in the hour when He was most fully and freely giving Himself ?

(7) What was the *sorrow* that drove Jesus into *solitude*, yet made Him crave *sympathy* ? The Gospels describe the Agony in the Garden in these words : " He began to be sorrowful and sore troubled " (Matt. xxvi. 37) ; " He began to be greatly amazed and sore troubled " (Mark xiv. 33) ; " And being in an agony, He prayed more earnestly : and His sweat became as it were great drops of blood falling down upon the ground " (Luke xxii. 44). It must be added

that Westcott and Hort give this and the preceding verse in double brackets "and regard them as no part of Luke's text, though a true element of the Christian tradition." Jesus confessed His own emotion in the saying, "My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death" (Matt. xxvi. 38, Mark xiv. 34).

(i.) This agony some have explained as due to the fear of death as physical dissolution. But this is to ascribe to Jesus a weakness from which many men and women have been entirely free, and which has in many other cases been thoroughly overcome by faith in Him. Is it likely that the first of the martyr band would bear Himself less bravely and calmly in the face of death than those who, following in His footsteps, and upheld by His companionship, faced death in many forms of torment with a smile or a song upon their lips? To the writer this explanation seems intolerable.

(ii.) Less obvious, but not on that account more probable, is the suggestion that Jesus feared that death might come upon Him before the appointed hour, that He would yield to bodily weakness and weariness before He could consummate His sacrifice on the Cross. To this suggestion three objections can be advanced. There is no evidence that Christ's physical exhaustion was such as to afford any ground for such a fear. How prosaic is the view of the death of Christ which assumes that its significance and value was wholly dependent on its outward mode! It is true that the death on the Cross has a tragic impressiveness that death through failure of vitality in the Garden would not have had; but it was in the soul of Jesus that the great sacrifice was offered, and the great salvation secured. It is incredible that Jesus' constant confident trust in His Heavenly Father's providence failed Him. Could He believe that God who had chosen, called, fitted, and kept Him for

this task would suffer Him to perish leaving it unfulfilled ?

(iii.) With very much deeper respect the writer must express his dissent from a third view. It was from the human crime of the Cross that Jesus shrank—the sin of man which was involved in His betrayal, abandonment, condemnation, and execution. The pain caused Him by Judas' treachery, and the estrangement and weakness of the other disciples, has already been noted, and doubtless this was a contributory element in His agony. As He looked forward to the means that would be used to bring about His death, He was doubtless filled with horror and shame. The craft and cruelty of the priesthood, the feebleness and fickleness of the populace, the cowardice of the Roman governor—these it is not at all improbable that Jesus with prophetic foresight anticipated, although the details of His trial, condemnation, and execution would not be known to Him. That human unbelief should reject, and human sin should resist, and human hate should pursue unto death, the Son of God, in word and deed revealing the love and communicating the grace of the Heavenly Father—that was to Jesus an apocalypse of the abysmal depths of man's fall from God. The deeds of treachery and denial, of cunning and malice, of vengeance and contempt that Jesus foresaw threw into bolder relief that dark background of moral iniquity that was ever present to His sinless consciousness. But what if the crime of the Cross involved a moral problem for Jesus Himself ? Might not this conflict of God and goodness in Him with the sin and hate in man be avoided ? Must He push this opposition to the uttermost ? Was He not involving in still deeper guilt His enemies by compelling them to do their worst ? Could He not spare them their greatest condemnation while escaping the sacrifice Himself ? He foresaw that the doom of the nation was bound up with its

dealings with Him. Could He not save both Himself and it by escape? Even if such thoughts never came to Him, of this at least we may be sure, that He did intensely realize the sin, guilt, and doom of all involved in the curse of His death, and that the realization was to Him anguish unspeakable. But this view does not seem to the writer adequate. Jesus' sense of the crime to be committed was surely the occasion for a wider and deeper consciousness of the sin of the race, of which this was one of the manifestations, the culmination of a world-wide, age-long process of rebellion against God.

(iv.) The agony in Gethsemane must be interpreted as an anticipation of the desolation on Calvary. What Jesus dreaded, and prayed to be delivered from, was the interruption of His filial communion with God, the obscuration of the gracious and glorious vision of God's Fatherhood. That He did experience this on the Cross, if only for a moment, the words, "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken Me" (Matt. xxvii. 46) show. We must ask whether we can make out a psychological probability that He anticipated this experience in Gethsemane. First of all, let us remind ourselves that Jesus regarded sin as a separation from God. Secondly, it has already been argued in the *previous Study* that He recognized in death the possibility of an interruption of even the saint's fellowship with God. Thirdly, He cherished the hope that, like some of the saints, He might escape this experience in death. But fourthly, in order to give His life a ransom for many, to offer the sacrifice of the new covenant, was it not probable that He would be brought to think that it might be necessary that He should be numbered with the transgressors, deprived of the comfort in death that the saints of God might look for? Thus, lastly, it is likely that in His saving love for man He felt Himself drawn, nay, driven into man's place.



He realized that sin necessarily involved darkness and desolation of soul in separation from God; He realized that as the Saviour of man from sin He must share this experience of man: Himself sinless, the curse of sin must fall on Him. As in His identification through love with man His consciousness came to be more and more filled with the shame and sorrow and shadow of the sin of mankind, realized in His sinless perfect nature more intensely than in the human soul, the consciousness of God as Father became more and more difficult to maintain. Even in Gethsemane had begun the process, finished on Calvary, in which the invasion of the consciousness of Jesus by the sin of mankind involved the expulsion from His consciousness of the clear and firm assurance of God's Fatherhood.

(8) What Jesus shrank from and *struggled against*, what He prayed to be delivered from in Gethsemane, was not death as physical dissolution, or any of its pains or pangs, not death as a sacrifice voluntarily offered for the salvation of mankind; but this possible element in His death as a sacrifice, the hiding of the Father's face, and the withdrawing of His Father's hand from Him. He regarded this experience as a temptation, for His words to His disciples, "Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation; the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak" (Matt. xxvi. 41) were spoken out of the depths of His own soul. Yet the temptation was accordant with His nature as the Son of God. It was fitting that the Son of God should recoil with terror and horror from the possibility of an interruption of His fellowship with His Father. The necessity of such an experience was gradually forcing itself upon His consciousness; He could not but struggle against acknowledging it; yet even in this He submits to the Father. "O My Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass away from Me; nevertheless not as I will, but as Thou wilt" (Matt. xxvi. 39). That



His death as a sacrifice for man's sin was necessary, we have no proof that Jesus ever doubted. What seemed possible to Him was death without this extreme of darkness and desolation. This possibility, He learnt in His communion with His Father, was excluded. His second prayer, as given by Matthew (v. 42), "O my Father, if this cannot pass away, except I drink it, Thy will be done," marks a fresh stage in His thought of His death. Even the worst conceivable must be endured. His struggle against this crown to all His sorrow ended in *surrender* to the will of God. He remained united to God by obedience, even when that obedience involved the interruption of His sustaining and satisfying filial communion with the Father. So resolved was He in love to God and man to obey God and to save man that He consented to give up the highest good of His life—the gladness of His Father's Presence. It may be that the necessity of this darkness and desolation in the death of Jesus is not apparent to us. Even after His recognition of its necessity, we may feel uncertain. To the writer, however, it seems that if we try to realize what God is, as revealed in Christ, and what sin is, as it was revealed in the rejection of Christ, if we try to hate sin as Christ hated it, and yet to love mankind as He loved it, if we try to recognize fully what must be the final issue of sin's opposition to God, and of God's condemnation of sin, if, in short, our consciousness becomes, in any degree, as was the consciousness of Jesus, the scene of the conflict between sin's worst and God's best, then the impossibility of this cup passing from Christ without His drinking it will become to us the content not of an intellectual demonstration, but of a moral intuition. It was upon His knees, wrestling with God in prayer, that this conviction came to Jesus. Can we expect to get it, or to keep it, in any other way ?

(9) Through this surrender to God strength came to Jesus. It is probable that the statement in Luke xxii. 43, "And there appeared unto Him an angel from heaven, strengthening Him," is not authentic. Yet the words of Jesus to the disciples when He returned to them after praying a third time—"Sleep on now, and take your rest : behold, the hour is at hand, and the Son of Man is betrayed into the hands of sinners. Arise, let us be going ; behold, he is at hand that betrayeth Me " (Matt. xxvi. 45, 46)—indicate a change of mood, a calmness, confidence, and courage that are in striking contrast to the sorrow and sore trouble with which He entered into the Garden. His dignity and mastery of spirit during His arrest, and trial, and on the way to the Cross, as well as on the Cross itself, showed how abundantly by waiting upon God He had renewed His strength. He had brought to God the earthly vessel of an obedient will, and it was filled with the heavenly treasure of triumphant strength.

(10) The passage in John xii. 27, 28—"Now is my soul troubled ; and what shall I say ? Father, save me from this hour. But for this cause came I unto this hour. Father, glorify Thy name"—if it is, as has been suggested, a reminiscence of Gethsemane, does not throw any fresh light on the Synoptic narrative ; but in no way contradicts the interpretation of the agony which has been given. That interpretation is confirmed by the reference to Gethsemane in Hebrews v. 7, 8, "Who in the days of His flesh, having offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto Him that was able to save Him from death, and having been heard for his godly fear ; though He was a son, yet learned obedience by the things which He suffered." Does not the phrase, "prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears," describe the struggle in the Garden ? Could the result of the struggle be better ex-

pressed than in the words, "though He was a Son, yet learned obedience by the things which He suffered"; that is, in His passion He discovered all that obedience involved, even this loss of the joy of the Father's presence? Was not His shrinking from this experience a "godly fear," and for its sake was He not heard, as the record of the Cross testifies? for the dereliction was but for a moment, and He was saved from death's deeper death, as with words of filial confidence He fell asleep in God (Luke xxiii. 46, "Jesus said, Father, into Thy hands I commend my spirit, and having said this, He gave up the ghost"). The Father's will was obeyed, and the Son's desire fulfilled.

(11) Although it is not intended in these *Studies* to discuss questions of Christian doctrine, yet the writer cannot close this discussion without calling attention to its bearing on the central position of evangelicalism. To him it seems that the objectivity of the Atonement is confirmed by this experience of Jesus in Gethsemane. It is the paternal authority of God that presents, and it is the filial obedience of Christ that accepts, the cup of sacrifice unto death in its uttermost darkness and desolation. The necessity of the Cross is rooted in the relation of the Father to the Son, of the Father as absolute moral perfection, to the Son as incarnate, and identifying Himself with humanity even in its sin, guilt, and doom. Whether the interpretation of Gethsemane given by the writer in this *Study* is correct or not, it is for the readers to judge; but he must add his own deep and growing conviction that no doctrine of the Atonement can be accepted as adequate which does not give its full significance and value to the experience of Jesus, of *Desolation on the Cross* (the subject of the next Study), as of *Agony in the Garden*.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

*THE EPISTLE OF JAMES AS A STOREHOUSE OF  
THE SAYINGS OF JESUS.*

To the New Testament student the Epistle of James presents some most perplexing problems. Its date has been variously determined at all possible periods from that of the earliest to the latest book in the New Testament. The question of its authorship has been strongly maintained, on the one hand, as certainly in accordance with the statement of the book itself, and the James there mentioned identified as the brother of the Lord, while, on the other, it has been as confidently stated that the book is anonymous, and the traditional ascription to James purely apocryphal. As to the book's content and purpose, many various theories have been held, some seeing in it a careful and logical discussion of points of doctrine and practice, while others describe it as a mere haphazard collection of independent sayings on religion and morals. Similarly its destination and place of origin have been decided in very diverse ways.

There is, therefore, abundant room for suggestion and critical investigation in connexion with this book, and the very diversity of opinion that prevails among competent critics leads the student to think that the proper solution has not yet been arrived at.

In all probability the first feature that will strike a careful reader of the book is the strong similarity that many of its sayings afford to the sayings of Jesus in the Gospels, particularly in the Gospel of Matthew, and in that section of it known as the "Sermon on the Mount." This has been noted by every commentator upon the Epistle, and long and careful lists of parallels are found in many books, most fully perhaps in Mayor's exhaustive study (pp. lxxxii.-ciii.). Many conclusions have been drawn from this obvious

resemblance, the most frequent one being that the writer had himself been a hearer of Jesus, and is giving his reminiscences of the words that had fallen from his Master's lips. This is the point of view of those who regard the book as a very early one, while others consider that the dependence is rather upon the first Gospel, as we now have it. The difficulty in the latter case is to account for the variety of the form in which the sayings occur. But it is not only with Matthew's Gospel, but with the majority of the other books of the New Testament, that resemblances have been discovered and dependence either of this Epistle upon the other books, or of them upon this Epistle assumed. P. Ewald, for example, in his treatise, *Das Hauptproblem der Evangelienfrage*, maintains the strong resemblance between this Epistle and the Johannine writings, and though probably he pushes the proof of connexion too far, yet many of the parallels are very striking. Every one can see the resemblances to passages in Paul's Epistles, while the question of respective dependence becomes acute when we study this Epistle alongside 1 Peter. As regards the Epistle to the Hebrews, Professor Mayor firmly holds that the xith chapter of that Epistle was written with a knowledge, on the part of the writer, of the Epistle of James, and he thinks that other resemblances are to be discovered ; while Pfleiderer has pointed out several close resemblances between this letter and the letters to the Seven Churches contained in Revelation. The question arises whether the true inwardness of these resemblances has not been missed by those who have noted and discussed them. What if, after all, James is not reminiscent of Peter nor Peter of James, but that both depend upon a common source ? To try to discover the latter and to show how its discovery may simplify many of these problems is the object of the present article.



Let us return, then, to an examination of the Epistle itself. A casual reading of it will reveal the fact that at intervals there occurs the slightly varying form of address to its readers, "My brethren" (i. 2, ii. 1, 14, iii. 1, 10, 12, v. 12, 19); "My beloved brethren" (i. 16, 19, ii. 5); and "Brethren" (iv. 11, v. 7, 9, 10). On each occasion these addresses accompany words which are among the most close parallels to the sayings of Jesus found in Matthew's Gospel. For example: "Count it all joy, my brethren, when ye fall into manifold temptations" (i. 2; cf. Matt. v. 11, 12, "Blessed are ye when men shall . . . persecute you . . . rejoice and be exceeding glad"). "Be not many teachers, my brethren, knowing that we shall receive heavier judgment" (iii. 1; cf. Matt. xxiii. 8, "Be not ye called Rabbi, for one is your teacher, and all ye are brethren"). "My brethren, these things ought not so to be. Doth the fountain send forth from the same opening sweet water and bitter? Can a fig tree, my brethren, yield olives, or a vine figs?" (iii. 11, 12; cf. Matt. vii. 16, "Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?"). And, once more, "But above all things, my brethren, swear not, neither by the heaven nor by the earth, nor by any other oath: but let your yea be yea, and your nay, nay, that ye fall not under judgment" (cf. Matt. v. 34-37, "Swear not at all, neither by the heaven . . . nor by the earth . . . but let your speech be yea, yea, nay, nay, and whatsoever is more than these is of the evil"). It is noteworthy that in various books of the early Christian literature the same practice is observed, and the address "brethren" seems to be frequently used as a kind of "signpost" to indicate quotations from Scripture, or, more particularly, from the words of Jesus (cf. 1 Clem. xiii., xiv., xvi. *ad fin.*, lvi. *ad fin.*). This usage is very marked in the so-called Second Epistle of Clement; but there, of course, the formula of

quotation is much more definite, though it is not always present, as in the passage in the xith chapter, which has close bearing upon our present subject, and runs, "Wherefore, my brethren, let us not be double-minded, but endure patiently, in hope that we may also obtain our reward; for faithful is He that promised to pay to each man the recompense of his works. If, therefore, we shall have wrought righteousness in the sight of God, we shall enter into His kingdom, and shall receive the promises which ear has not heard nor eye seen, neither hath it entered into the heart of man." Even in the Epistles of Ignatius the same usage is discoverable; e.g., the Epistle to the Philadelphians, par. 3, reads: "Be not deceived, my brethren. If any man followeth one that maketh a schism, *he doth not inherit the kingdom of God.*"

If we regard these, with the suggested indication attached to them, as definitely being sayings of Jesus, and leave, for the moment, the question of their source undecided, we shall turn, in the second place, to another class of passages in the Epistle, about which we have indications of another nature that lead us to recognize them as being also sayings of Jesus. The first of these is i. 12, "Blessed is the man that endureth temptation, for when he hath been approved he shall receive the crown of life which the Lord promised to them that love him." This saying is presented in the form of a beatitude, a form that was frequently upon our Lord's lips. The words find echo also in 1 Peter iii. 14, and iv. 14, and even more remarkably in 2 Timothy iv. 7, 8, and Rev. ii. 10 and iii. 2. All these well known references to the "crown of life," particularly where, as in Revelation, the words are put into the mouth of our Lord Himself, seem to point to a traditional saying of Jesus known to the early church; and this view is supported by the passage in the apocryphal

Acts of Philip, which runs : " Blessed is he who has his raiment white, for it is he who receiveth the crown of joy " (cf. Resch, *Agrapha*, p. 253); cf. also Tertull. de Bap. c. 20 : " *Neminem intentatum regna coelestia consecuturum*," a saying he attributes to Jesus. Another striking instance is found in chapter ii. 17, 26, " Even so faith, if it have not works, is dead in itself. For as the body apart from the spirit is dead, even so faith apart from works is dead " (cf. Rev. iii. 1 : " I know thy works, that thou hast a name that thou livest and thou art dead "). This striking saying is in agreement with much of the teaching of Jesus recorded in the Gospels, such passages as " Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, etc.," and may easily be a record of a definite saying that is not found elsewhere. The striking reference to Rahab, as an example of faith, common to this Epistle (ii. 25) and that to the Hebrews (ii. 31), may very possibly be due to some reference to her made by Jesus. As it is, He is recorded to have used rather extraordinary examples from the Old Testament. Lot, Jonah, Solomon and the Queen of Sheba are not four we should have picked out as the most likely persons for our Lord to instance from the wide field of Jewish history, and it is quite probable that in Rahab also He found a lesson useful to His hearers. The striking passage on the use of the tongue, given in the third chapter of the Epistle, reads extremely like an utterance of the Master's, and we have at least two statements parallel to it contained in Matthew's Gospel, that about being called to account for every idle word (xii. 36), and the passage in the xivth chapter which describes the true causes of defilement. May it not be that the elaborate passage in James has preserved recollections of sayings that are not elsewhere retained, especially as we have already seen that it closes with a close parallel to a parabolic utterance related in Matthew ? The teaching

on the proper attitude toward the morrow (iv. 13-17) has a certain connexion with the teaching as to the proper attitude toward the morrow contained in the latter verses of the fifth chapter of Matthew, and the same passage closes with words which find echoes, not only in the recorded words of Jesus, but elsewhere in the New Testament, "To him, therefore, that knoweth to do good and doeth it not, to him it is sin." This reminds us of the parable in Matthew vii. of the two builders; of the words in Luke xii. 47, 48 about the servants who knew, and who did not know the Lord's will; in John ix. 41, of those who, because they say "We see," are assured that their sin remaineth. The immediately succeeding passage in reference to riches stands in close connexion with the verses in Matthew vi. 19-21 about the treasure on earth and in heaven, while Matthew vi. 22-24 finds its parallel in James iv. 4, 8.<sup>1</sup>

Let us now turn to one or two passages which are cited as parallels between this Epistle and those of Paul, and consider what light they throw on our present argument. James ii. 5, the passage which we have already seen has the indication within it of being a quotation, reads, "Did not God choose them that are poor as to the world to be rich in faith and heirs of the kingdom which He promised to them that love Him?" In 1 Corinthians i. 27 Paul speaks of the foolish things of the world putting to shame those that are wise, etc.—an idea that is also found in another form in James i. 9, "Let the brother of low degree glory in his high estate." The phrase in James i. 18, "the word of truth," is found nowhere else save in Paul's Epistles. A close parallel is to be found between the treatment of the law in James iv. 11, 12, and Romans ii. 1-3. Again, James i. 3-4 reads, "Knowing that the proof of your faith

<sup>1</sup> Cf. "The Lord's Prayer in the Early Church," by Dr. Chase, in *Texts and Studies*, i. 3, p. 47 f.



worketh patience. And let patience have its perfect work, that ye may be perfect and entire, lacking in nothing." Compare with this Romans v. 3-5, "Let us rejoice in our tribulations, knowing that tribulation worketh patience, and patience probation, and probation hope, etc." Upon these latter words Professor Mayor remarks: "Here it is more probable that Paul is working up a hint received from James than that the less complete analysis should have been borrowed from the more complete," and he regards in a similar light James i. 18, 25, compared with Romans viii. 21, 23, and xi. 16. In a somewhat similar way he speaks of James i. 4, i. 14, iv. 6 as compared with Ephesians iv. 13, 14, and, again, Professor Mayor thinks that the passage in 2 Timothy ii. 12 may be derived from an "early hymn founded on the same original *agraphon* as the verse James i. 12." As over against these explanations of the passages referred to, and many others that might be quoted, it is surely easier and more natural to believe that both writers are dependent upon traditional sayings of Jesus, that each one of them has presented in a somewhat varying form; and if it be objected that neither in James nor in Paul is there the slightest indication that the words referred to are quotations, we find the practice of weaving in words, that were recognized as quotations, with the statements of the writer himself to have been a common one. An excellent instance of this is to be found in the opening paragraphs of the *Didaché*, which are too well known to require quotation here.

Another point of great interest with regard to this Epistle consists of the consideration of the many parallels that have been discovered between it and the two famous Jewish books of wisdom, Ecclesiasticus and the Wisdom of Solomon. The most famous of these is the passage on the tongue, which has many parallels in the former book. A



very striking parallel is that between James i. 12-15, and Ecclus. xv. 11-20, a passage that begins, "Say not thou it is through the Lord that I fell away, for thou shalt not do the things that He hateth. Say not thou it is He that caused me to err, for He hath no need of a sinful man." One of the most striking parallels with the book of wisdom is the passage in the Epistle already referred to which contains the promise of the "crown of life." The words are found in Wisdom v. 16: "Therefore shall they receive the crown of royal dignity and the diadem of beauty from the Lord's hand." (For a full list of parallels see Mayor, pp. lxxiii. to lxxvi. *l.c.*) The importance of this latter class of parallels for the theory here maintained is, that we have not many references in the Gospels to our Lord's acquaintance with the extra-canonical books of wisdom, and yet we cannot but suppose that He was familiar with them. And if we can find here evidence that sayings of His have a strong resemblance to sayings contained in these books, we have the best possible proof that He not only knew, but Himself employed, their thought and language.

The question now arises as to how we are to relate all these isolated investigations as to individual verses into a theory about the construction of the whole book, and here we must first ask, with Harnack, is it an epistle at all? And the only answer that seems possible is, that it is not. Then, if it is not an epistle, what is it? It seems unlikely that it should be a mere collection of aphorisms, however excellent and however necessary for the guidance of those for whom they were designed. Nor is it easy to see how it can be a combination of letter, address, and exhortation; and yet it seems impossible to discover in it any definite logical system. We have already seen that in material, and sometimes in form of expression, it stands more closely allied to the Sermon on the Mount than to any other section

of the New Testament ; but we may push that resemblance farther, and maintain that, in the form of its composition, it also bears close likeness to that passage of the First Gospel. It is notoriously difficult to find for the Sermon on the Mount any logical scheme of composition, and the most ingenious of systematic arrangements find every now and again great difficulty in bringing certain verses under their plan. Ideas of connexion may, indeed, have influenced the Evangelist as he wrote, but they are not easy to discover now. That the same thing is true of this Epistle causes us to ask the question whether the reason is not identical, namely, that the writer is also endeavouring to make a collection of sayings, all of which he values, none of which he wishes to lose, and yet he finds it extremely difficult to fit them into an ordered mosaic. In the case of the Sermon on the Mount, there are a good many verses which modern scholarship is inclined to doubt, at least in their present form, as authentic utterances of Jesus, which seems to show that the compiler may have used a good deal of freedom with his material, and have, in certain cases, either added notes of his own, or embodied reflections of some recognized interpreter, or of the Christian community, in his final revision of his material. Now, all this helps us in relation to the present book. Here, too, it would seem, if there is any truth in what has already been said, that we have a certain number, at least, of sayings of Jesus contained in these chapters. In moving from the better-known to the less-known, we have found that there are a large number of sayings contained in this writing which are paralleled in other writers of the New Testament, and that it is more probable that they all go back upon a common original than that the one should copy from the other. If these also are sayings of Jesus, this is perfectly natural and explicable. But it is quite clear that a large part of

the book cannot consist of sayings of the Lord, unless in an extremely modified and altered form. Comparison, however, with other books such as the *Didaché*, has shown us that it was no uncommon practice to mingle recognized sayings of Jesus with the thoughts and utterances of the writer, and this book appears to have been such a treatise, but one probably of a unique and special character. It seems to have been founded upon a collection of cherished sayings of the Master, and round these have been gathered other sayings perhaps not so well authenticated, with reflections upon them, and explanations of them, as given probably in the gatherings of the disciples. We seem thus to have here a combination of an early collection (perhaps one of the earliest) of the Lord's sayings, that may have been read in the gatherings of His followers, combined with reminiscences of the earliest applications of these sayings to the thought and needs of the first disciples.

But how, then, did this book come to bear the name of James? Because, in all probability, the collection of sayings was due to his hand. Who more likely than he to remember some words of his famous Brother, that other collectors had forgotten to record? Who would more probably cherish the sayings of a peculiarly Jewish caste, and those which were founded upon, or related to, the books of Wisdom, so beloved by himself and his co-religionists, than James? This fact may have been well known to the early Christian community, and that special collection of sayings may have been preserved and used in Jerusalem. When the city was destroyed, and the Christians fled, this manuscript may have been taken with them as one of their most valuable possessions. In the course of time the original words may, as I have hinted, have been mingled with many other teachings and reflections, until, finally, they came to form a short treatise of practical conduct,

a guide to the Christian life, a sort of "church members' manual," if we may be allowed a modern expression. Then the church (whether in Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, or in some unknown place, matters not) that possessed this valuable legacy, felt it was only right that it should share its privilege with its fellow-Christians, who belonged also to the Jewish race, and resolved to circulate it among the Christian communities of their fellow-countrymen throughout the world. They had no name to give to it, but they knew it depended originally on the great head of the Church at Jerusalem, and so they sent it out in the name of James. Thus we can account for the lateness of the book's appearance. Its circulation may well be quite late in the second century, and yet, on the other hand, the foundation of the book may be the very earliest of all the writings of the New Testament, and thus a point of union may be found between the conflicting theories of modern scholarship, and we may rejoice again in this exquisite little treatise, as in one of the most precious possessions of our Christian faith. We have often felt, in reading it, as a man feels, who has once listened to a wonderful piece of music exquisitely played, and in later days has heard haunting melodies that recalled now one strain, and now another, of the great work. He could not be sure whether they were extracts from it, imitations of it, or other compositions of the one master, but they awakened the same feelings of joy and brought back all the delightful memories. Thus is it, when we turn from the perusal of the Gospels to the pages of James; and what if the reason be that, in the main, the same Great Voice is speaking?

G. CURRIE MARTIN.

## JOB.

IN one of his most suggestive *Thoughts*, Pascal connects man's greatness with his sense of misery. "Man is great," he says, "in his knowledge of his misery." And certainly the evidence of literature would bear this out. For the greatest works of literary art, which reflect the deepest thoughts of the noblest minds, are those which turn upon the pains and sorrows of life. Among these the Book of Job occupies a unique place. It is not only, as Luther says, "magnificent and sublime as no other book of Scripture"; it is even (to quote Tennyson's words as typical) "the greatest poem whether of ancient or of modern times."

With this general judgment perhaps all would concur. But when we pass to closer study of the book, we are bewildered by the endless diversity of opinion that meets us. Even on the question of the literary character of the book it is almost *quot homines, tot opiniones*. According to some authorities, the book is an *epic*; according to others, a *drama*, or more specifically a *tragedy*; and according to still others, a *didactic poem*. As if to comprehend all possible varieties of opinion, Dillmann calls it an "epic-dramatic didactic poem" (*ein episch-dramatisch Lehrgedicht*<sup>1</sup>). On the other hand, there are those who refuse to class the book in any of the recognized literary forms. "We cannot," it is said, "force this splendid piece of Hebrew wisdom into a Greek schema, and it is really futile to discuss whether it is a drama or an epic. It is itself."<sup>2</sup> If possible, still more diverse are the judgments pronounced on the theme and purpose of the book, the "problem of Job." Here, again, all possible rubrics and formulae have been adopted. The sufferings of Job are described as the trial of his piety,

<sup>1</sup> *Hioh*, p. xxiii.

<sup>2</sup> Peake, *Job* (Century Bible), p. 41.



the test by which God brought to light the sterling reality of his faith; or again, as the discipline through which God purified him from his uncleanness and impiety, and thus worked out the perfecting of his character.<sup>1</sup> Other scholars have found the tendency of the poem to be purely negative—to clear the ground of outworn theories of sin and suffering, or even sceptical and pessimistic. And others read it simply as the drama of a heroic soul's sufferings. Amid such diversity, it may appear bold even to seek for a solution, far more to hazard any personal opinion. But if we cannot hope to solve the problem, we may at least (to use the word which Goethe applies to this very book) “fence it round.”

In its opening scene, the prologue introduces us to Job, a man that was “perfect and upright, one that feared God and eschewed evil,” surrounded with all the prosperity that (according to the religious axiom of the day) belonged of right to the good: a wealth of substance that made him “the greatest of all the children of the East,” and a family of sons and daughters virtuous and prosperous as himself. Even in those days of simple faith increase of this world's goods often turned men's hearts from God. But Job's prosperity made him the more scrupulous in his regard of God. He not only eschewed open sins in himself, but he sought to guard against even the suspicion of unconscious sin in his children's hearts. He was no morose Puritan. He rejoiced in their innocent enjoyments. But he knew how easily pleasure leads to forgetfulness of God. And therefore, week by week, when the cycle of their feasting was gone round, he “sent and sanctified them, and offered burnt offerings according to the number of them all; for Job said, ‘It may be that my sons have sinned in renouncing

<sup>1</sup> German scholars have drawn up quite a table of categories, under which Job's sufferings may be classed: *Prüfungs-*, *Bewährungs-*, *Zeugniss-*, *Züchtigungs-* und *Läuterungs-*, and *Förderungs-leiden*.

God in their hearts.'” Job is thus set before us as the perfect pattern of a great and good man.

The scene now shifts from earth to heaven. Jahveh is revealed seated on His throne, receiving the reports of His ministers of state, the heavenly beings who do His royal business. Among them appears the Satan, a sort of Prosecutor-General, whose function is to search men's character and works, to detect their sins and failings, and so oppose their claims to a righteous standing before God. He has been scouring through the earth, gathering up his tale of ill report, and he comes with a certain malicious glee to pour it into the ears of the king. But the God who has no delight in evil meets him with at least one clear case of goodness. “Hast thou considered my servant Job, that there is none like him in the earth, a perfect and an upright man, one that feareth God, and escheweth evil ?” The Satan's knowledge of frail man has given him so cynical a contempt for human virtue that he will make no exception even of Job. He admits the fact of his exemplary piety, indeed. But he raises the fiendish suggestion : “Doth Job serve God for nought ?” Is not self-interest the real root of all his fine piety ? For “hast not Thou made an hedge about him, and about all that he hath on every side ? Thou hast blessed the work of his hands, and his substance is increased in the land.” And then he throws down the gauntlet, and challenges God to a test of His servant's piety : “But put forth Thine hand now, and touch all that he hath ; and see whether he will not renounce Thee to Thy face.” Jahveh immediately accepts the challenge. He knows His servant Job is a “perfect and upright man,” who will hold fast his faith through every turn of fortune. But suspicion has been cast upon the sincerity of his piety ; and the servant of God must be above suspicion. Therefore, for his honour's sake,

as well as His own good name, He hands him over to the Satan's power ; and " he goes forth from the presence of the Lord."

In the next scene we have the terrible sequel. It is the day when Job's children are eating and drinking in their elder brother's house. That very morning their father has sanctified them, atoning for all possible guilt they may have incurred by thoughtless sin, and he now rests securely, trusting his lot and theirs to the Almighty care, when suddenly, with tragic swiftness, messenger after messenger arrives with tidings of disaster, utter and irreparable. His oxen, sheep, camels and servants, and—last crushing blow—his sons and daughters have been swept away. Job has lost all but his piety. The Satan had confidently expected that he would cast that too away, and renounce God to His face. But loss and sorrow only brought out the full splendour of Job's faith. In the midst of his desolation, in spite of his belief that God had afflicted him thus, " he imputed no wrong to God," but rather worshipped. " The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away ; blessed be the name of the Lord."

Again the heavenly Court is convened. The heart of Jahveh is filled with a quiet exultation because of His servant's victorious faith. But the Satan is as cynically suspicious as ever. Talk not to him of human goodness ! It is all mercenary, a matter of profit and interest, " skin for skin," measure for measure. Yes ! Job can bear easily enough the loss of goods and children. But touch himself, " his own bone and flesh," and he will then renounce Thee to Thy face ! " And now we see Job seated on the village ash-heap, smitten with a slow and fatal disease, the most loathsome and painful of all, a disease whose very name marked it out as the special "stroke of God"<sup>1</sup> for sin. And to add to his misery, his wife assumes the rôle of the

<sup>1</sup> צָרָא, leprosy, *lit.* stroke.

Satan's advocate. "If this be all the reward of piety, have done with it! Renounce God, that He may slay thee outright, and release thee from thy sufferings!" But Job's faith can stand the very extremity of trial. His terrible sufferings but bring to light the hidden depths of his piety; and his answer is the classical expression even of Christian resignation. "What? When we receive so much good at the hands of God, shall we not also accept evil when He sends it?"

So far then as the prologue is concerned, the motive is clear and consistent. The question round which all turns is the sincerity of man's faith. Is there really such a thing as disinterested piety? Or do men serve God for their own selfish ends? In answer to this question, the prologue sets before us the spectacle of Job the righteous, suffering the loss of all things, and even the extreme of personal agony, yet holding fast his faith in God, and even blessing the hand that smote. And the light which is thus cast on the mystery of suffering is this: the pains and sorrows which befall the righteous are the test by which God reveals to men and angels the reality of godliness.

If the prologue be the introduction proper, then we have here the key to the poem as well. As Dr. Davidson puts it with his own incisiveness: "This question—Doth Job serve God for nought?—is the problem of the book."<sup>1</sup> But the difficulty is just to bring the poem under this schema. And the learning and insight which Davidson and his great *confrères*, Delitzsch and Dillmann, have applied to the problem but throw the difficulty into clearer relief. It is not merely that the bearing of Job is different. But the whole centre of interest changes. In the poem, the Satan and his challengings of disinterested goodness vanish. It is no longer Job's piety, but God's justice, that is in question. As even Godet (a strong supporter of the unity of the book,

<sup>1</sup> *Comm. on Job*, p. xvi.

and a scholar who finds the key to the poem in the prologue) admits : " The Being who is brought to the bar of judgment is in reality not Job, it is Jehovah. The point in debate is not only the virtue of Job ; it is, at the same time, and in a still higher degree, the justice of God." <sup>1</sup> And Job is now the Prometheus who boldly challenges the justice of God's ways. The problem of the poem is to reconcile faith with God's mysterious providence ; and it ends in God's appearing, not to reveal to His steadfast servant the meaning of his sufferings, but to vindicate His own character as worthy of trust. <sup>2</sup>

It is in the epilogue, rather, that we find the real sequel to the prologue. The two, indeed, form an almost completely connected narrative. The weary sufferer has triumphantly withstood the " impious " <sup>3</sup> suggestions of his wife and friends, and emerged from his trial true as gold. The Satan's assault on his piety has thus turned to the glory of God and the honour of pure religion. And now God puts forth His hand to reward His faithful servant. His wrath is kindled against the friends for their " impious " words ; but Job's bearing throughout his trial He approves as per-

<sup>1</sup> *O. T. Studies*, p. 186.

<sup>2</sup> The latest and most elaborate attempt to prove the integral unity of prologue and poem, Dr. Karl Kautzsch, *Das sogenannte Volksbuch von Hiob* (1900), escapes the real difficulty only by evading it. According to this scholar, the prologue merely sets forth the general facts of the case, the appearance of Satan and his challenge of Job's piety being but picturesque staging. This, of course, is to cut the heart out of the prologue.

<sup>3</sup> The word נְבִלָה (42, 8) is too strong to characterize the friends' speeches in our present poem. The same word is used by Job to denounce his wife's suggestion to " curse God and die " ; to him she is like אִמֹת הַנְּבִלֹת (" one of the impious, godless women "). The friends' speeches are anything but godless. And Job's speeches in the poem are as far from being " correct " or orthodox. Jahveh Himself describes them as " words without knowledge " which " darken counsel " (xxxviii. 2) and " cavil " against the Almighty and His ways (xl. 2). We are to suppose that, in the original prose tale, the wife's suggestion was followed by similar counsel on the part of the friends, which Job rejects with the same horror, and which Jahveh then denounces as " impiety." These speeches would probably be quite short.



fectly correct. And in token of His approval, He changes Job's fortune, restoring him twice as much as he had before, and blessing his latter end more than his beginning.

On these grounds we have been led irresistibly to the conclusion—first suggested by Wellhausen in a review of Dillmann's *Hiõb* in 1871, and worked out most elaborately by Budde and Duhm—that the prologue and epilogue originally formed the main part of an older prose tale of Job's sufferings, which the poet has adopted as the framework of his book. We cannot, indeed, follow these critics in their idea that this prose tale is a pre-exilic *Volksbuch*. The materials were no doubt drawn from the old tradition of Job known to Ezekiel (xiv. 14, 20), who classes Job with Noah and Daniel as the patterns of piety in the hoary days of old. But the advanced idea of the Satan<sup>1</sup> stamps the book, as we have it, as post-exilic, while the *tendency* of the story seems too strongly marked for a mere *Volkssage*. We regard it, rather, as a pious prose tale—or prose *epic*, as this part of the book may fittingly be termed—written to cheer the hearts of the people of God in the troublous days which followed the Exile, when the righteous suffered, and the wicked saw long and happy years, and when so many forsook the fear of the Lord because, as they said, “it was vain to serve Him, and there was no profit in keeping His charge and walking mournfully before Him,”<sup>2</sup> for “every one that doeth evil is good in the sight of the Lord, and He delighteth in them.”<sup>3</sup> By the picture of Job the righteous suffering, and through his stedfast endurance bearing witness to the reality of godliness, the writer encourages the righteous sufferers of his day to endure their afflictions

<sup>1</sup> It is in Zech. iii. (B.C. 520) that we first meet with this advanced idea of the Satan.

<sup>2</sup> Mal. iii. 14. <sup>3</sup> Mal. ii. 17. The prophecy of Malachi (probably just before the times of Ezra) faces the same problem as the prologue of Job. This is an additional reason for our assigning the prologue to the same general period. It was, indeed, only after the exile that the problem of individual suffering became an acute one.

bravely ; for these are not (as they imagine in their heaviness of heart) the outpouring of the Divine wrath because of their sins, but the test by which God means to bring to light the purity of their faith and piety. If they hold fast their faith as Job did, they too will be witnesses for God to their generation, and soon He will appear to champion their cause, and will bless their latter end more than their beginning.

The poem sounds far profounder depths. Job is still the hero. And the prose tale is retained as the general introduction to the piece. But the poet can no longer rest content with its cheering view of suffering as the trial of faith, to be made good by double prosperity. Nor does he present Job any more as the type of the patient sufferer. Instead he brings him to the lowest abyss of despair, and makes him even break out into blasphemous invectives against God and His ways. We cannot doubt that in this he gives expression to his own personal feelings. The poet is one who has felt the iron of suffering pass deeply into his own soul, and has been driven by the cold consolations of unsympathetic friends and their hard *doctrinaire* ideas of Divine providence into open revolt against the God of popular imagination, but has fought his way through despair and doubt, if not to clear light, yet to a freer and nobler faith in God. And in the poem he has opened his heart, and spoken out all the feelings that passed through his soul in his agony of sorrow, till he found rest again in God.

And thus perhaps we may call the poem (reversing Browning's title) a *lyrical drama*. Its component parts are distinctively lyrical. They are the immediate outflow of the feelings of the heart. And the movement of the poem as a whole is dramatic, through darkness to light, through struggle and doubt to new faith and peace.

ALEX. R. GORDON.

(To be concluded.)

## THE MAGNIFICAT.

### I.

It has recently been argued<sup>1</sup> with much ingenuity by Professor Burkitt that the true interpretation of St. Luke's narrative of the Visit of Mary to Elisabeth suggests that he meant to place the hymn *Magnificat* in the mouth of Elisabeth. A few MSS. of the Latin Gospels (*a*, *b*, *l*\*), indeed, actually read *et ait Elisabeth* in Luke i. 46; and it has been shown that Niceta of Remesiana,<sup>2</sup> a fourth century bishop (to whom the authorship of *Te Deum* is now ascribed by many good scholars) followed this tradition, of which there are also traces in the Latin versions of Origen and Irenaeus. Full details will be found in Professor Burkitt's article, and in a brilliant essay taking the same line published in 1900 by Professor Harnack.<sup>3</sup> But there is no doubt that an overwhelming majority of MSS., versions, and early interpreters, are on the side of the traditional *And Mary said*, with which *Magnificat* is introduced in all printed editions of St. Luke's Gospel. Nothing ought to be allowed to set this aside, except some incoherence or inconsequence in the text thus attested, of so grave a character that internal evidence might, for once, be permitted to outweigh the external and objective testimony of the MSS. The *onus probandi* lies with those who ask us to abandon MS. authority; and unless it can be shown that there is something in the hymn itself, or in the phrases in its immediate context, which forbids us to believe that St. Luke intended to represent the Virgin as

<sup>1</sup> *Journal of Theological Studies* for Jan. 1906, p. 220 ff.

<sup>2</sup> See A. E. Burn's edition of his Works, p. 76.

<sup>3</sup> *Das Magnificat der Elisabeth* (Sitz.-ber. of the Berlin Academy, pp. 538 ff.

the speaker of it, we must continue to accept *And Mary said* as his introduction to *Magnificat*.<sup>1</sup> First, then, are there any tell-tale phrases in the context which prove that the reading *And Mary said* cannot be in accordance with the original writer's intention? Professor Burkitt points in reply to the words *σὺν αὐτῇ* in Luke i. 56, which, he holds, indicate that Elisabeth is to be taken as the speaker of the preceding verses. The sequence of the conversation is as follows :

i. 40. Mary greets Elisabeth.

i. 41-45. Elisabeth, being filled with the Holy Spirit, salutes Mary in the words *Blessed* (εὐλογημένη) *art thou among women . . . and happy* (μακαρία) *is she that believed, because there shall be a fulfilment of the things which were spoken to her from the Lord.*

i. 46-55. *And Mary said, Magnificat . . .*

i. 56. *And Mary abode with her about three months, and returned to her own house.*

Now it is quite true that the pronoun "her" in the last-quoted verse refers (according to the ordinary interpretation) to an antecedent (sc. Elisabeth) separated from it by a dozen verses. And it is quite probable that this awkwardness of phrase accounts for the variant reading *Elisabeth* in i. 46, as is suggested in the critical notes of Westcott and Hort. But, surely, awkwardness (or freedom) of this kind in the use of pronouns abounds in the Greek Bible. Take two or three instances :

(1) Gen. xix. 23-26: "The sun was risen upon the earth when Lot came unto Zoar. Then the Lord rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the Lord out of heaven; and He overthrew those

<sup>1</sup> I do not enter into the question as to whether the autograph may not have been *And she said*, no personal name being given, as Prof. Burkitt and Prof. Harnack and the Bishop of Salisbury think probable. That may be a true conjecture; but the question of interest remains, To whom did St. Luke mean to ascribe the hymn?

cities and all the Plain and all the inhabitants of the cities and that which grew upon the ground. But his wife (ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ is the LXX) looked back from behind him . . .” Whose wife? Lot’s, without doubt, but the antecedent is a long way back, if purity and precision of style are demanded.

(2) Tobit xiv. 3-12: “Now he (Tobit) grew very old; and he called his son, and the six sons of his son, and said unto him . . . *here follows a long charge of eight verses* . . . And while he was saying these things, he gave up the ghost in his bed; but he was a hundred and eight and fifty years old; and he buried him magnificently.” Now the antecedent of the last “he” is Tobias, who has not been mentioned during a speech of eight verses, much longer than *Magnificat*.

(3) Acts xv. 1-2. “And certain men having come down from Judaea taught the brethren that ‘except ye be circumcised after the custom of Moses ye cannot be saved.’ And when Paul and Barnabas had no small dissension and questioning with them, they appointed that Paul and Barnabas and certain others of them should go up to Jerusalem to the apostles and elders about this question”; i.e. καί τινες κατελθόντες ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας . . . γενομένης δὲ στάσεως, καὶ ζητήσεως οὐκ ὀλίγης τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ τῷ Βαρνάβᾳ πρὸς, αὐτοὺς ἔταξαν ἀναβαίνειν Παῦλον καὶ Βαρνάβαν κτλ. We ask what is the subject of ἔταξαν, “they appointed”? Probably it is the Christian brethren at Antioch; but it might be the men “from Judaea.” And the Western Text of Acts has actually got the reading οἱ δὲ ἐληλυθότες ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ παρήγγειλαν αὐτοῖς τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ Βαρνάβᾳ καὶ τισιν ἄλλοις ἀναβαίνειν. This is a case in which the awkwardness of the ordinary text seems to be responsible for the variant reading, exactly as in Luke i. 46, *Elisabeth* is read for *Mary* in a few Latin versions, owing to the distance of αὐτῆς from its antecedent in verse 56.



That is to say, there is no real difficulty in referring *αὐτῆς* to an antecedent a dozen verses back, when we recall the freedom in the use of pronouns throughout the Greek Bible, and remember that even in St. Luke's writings ambiguity is sometimes due to a like cause. *Αὐτῆς* is not as far removed from its antecedent as is the subject of the word "buried" in Tobit iii. 12; and the passage just quoted from the Acts shows that St. Luke's occasional awkwardness in the construction of his sentences may lead to a variant reading and the consequent misinterpretation of a pronoun. So far as *μετ' αὐτῆς* in Luke i. 56 is concerned, there is nothing to show that it does not refer to Elisabeth, who was the speaker in verses 42-45.

We have, next, to ask if there is anything in the hymn itself which is more appropriate to Elisabeth than to Mary. It is urged that, in the absence of any indication of the speaker, it might be regarded as appropriate to either, and I recognize that, modelled as it is on the Song of Hannah—a point to which I shall come back later on—most of it would be suitable in the mouth of Elisabeth. Professor Burkitt calls attention to the words of Hannah's prayer (1 Sam. i. 11), "If thou wilt look on the affliction of thine handmaid and remember me, and not forget thine handmaid," which are parallel to Luke i. 48, "He hath regarded the lowliness of his handmaiden." And it might be added that the words placed in the mouth of the barren woman in 2 Esdras ix. 45 show that *Magnificat* would be suitable enough in a case like that of Elisabeth: "It came to pass after thirty years that God heard me, thine handmaid, and looked upon my low estate and considered my trouble and gave me a son" (*exaudivit me Deus ancillae tuae et pervidit humilitatem meam*). The Greek is not extant, but it is quite clear from the Latin version that the author of 2 Esdras (who wrote about the same time as St. Luke) would

have felt that Luke i. 48a would be appropriate on the lips of Elisabeth.

This, however, does not prove that it would not be also appropriate on the lips of Mary, and I believe that there are definite indications (apart from *And Mary said* of Luke i. 46) that the Evangelist meant to assign it to her. For instance, the word *δούλη* of verse 48 (which goes back, as has been said, to Hannah's Song) is surely intended to be taken with *ἡ δούλη κυρίου* of verse 38. "Behold the handmaiden of the Lord" is all that Mary will say when her destiny is revealed to her; when she breaks out into thanksgiving she speaks of herself in the same phrase of humility.

Again, take the word *μακαριοῦσιν* in Luke i. 48: "All generations shall call me *blessed*, or *happy*." Although it is from this verse that the Church has learnt to call the Virgin *Blessed*, yet *μακαρία* need not mean more than *happy*, and (as Professor Burkitt has reminded us) is a usual word for a "*happy mother*."<sup>1</sup> Indeed the verse 48b of *Magnificat* is but an adaptation of Leah's thanksgiving on the birth of Asher, *μακαρία ἐγώ, ὅτι μακαρίζουσίν με πᾶσαι αἱ γυναῖκες*. The verb would be appropriate for Elisabeth; there is no doubt of it. But, again, surely St. Luke intended the use of the verb *μακαριοῦσιν* in *Magnificat* to correspond to and take up the salutation of Elisabeth to Mary in verse 45, *μακαρία ἡ πιστεύασα ὅτι ἔσται τελείωσις τοῖς λελαλημένοις αὐτῇ παρὰ κυρίου*. Elisabeth greets Mary as *blessed* (*εὐλογημένη*) and the fruit of her womb as *blessed* (*εὐλογημένος*); but she also offers her congratulations upon the *happiness* in store for her. "*Happy* is she that believed, for, etc." I think that to miss this correspondence between Luke i. 45 and Luke i. 48 is to miss something that the Evangelist intended to convey. And if the correspondence was intentional, then St. Luke meant *Magnificat*

<sup>1</sup> *Beata Maria*, not *benedicta*, which would be the equivalent of *εὐλογημένη* in Elisabeth's salutation, but which has not been adopted by the Church as the designation of the Virgin.

to be spoken by Mary, whether *Μαριάμ* in verse 46 was written by him or not.

Further, while Elisabeth might say (as Leah did) *μακαρίζουσίν με πᾶσαι αἱ γυναῖκες*, it would be a gross exaggeration for her to say *πᾶσαι αἱ γενεαί*. Zacharias had, indeed, been told of the son that she should bear, *πολλοὶ ἐπὶ τῇ γενέσει αὐτοῦ χαρήσονται* (i. 14); but the thankfulness of Elisabeth is not once connected with any anticipations of the future greatness of her son. She is humbly thankful that her "reproach" has been removed (i. 25; cp. i. 36); that is all. Her exultation in vv. 42-45 is ascribed to her recognition of the supreme blessing in store for Mary, i.e. that she should be the mother of Messiah; and to pass from this to an utterance of thanksgiving for the lesser joy of her own motherhood (as we must suppose her to do, if *Magnificat* is hers) would be inexplicable at this point of the narrative. For *Magnificat* is clearly a hymn of exultation for mercies personal to the speaker (*μακαριοῦσίν με . . . ἐποίησέν μοι μεγάλα*).

And, more generally, it would be, as it seems, to rob St. Luke's narrative of its climax, if *Magnificat* were not spoken by Mary. For in that case, she would be represented as receiving in unbroken silence the greeting and the sympathy of Elisabeth, which it was the object of her visit to elicit. Let us go through the story as it stands, and I believe we shall be impressed with its artistic completeness and its coherence.

The incident with which St. Luke connects the recitation of *Magnificat* is the visit of Mary to her kinswoman Elisabeth. Mary has learnt from a heavenly messenger of the destiny in store for her; and she goes in haste (*μετὰ σπουδῆς*)—how natural the story is!—to tell of her perplexity and her trembling hope to an older woman, who will sympathize and understand, for she, too, is soon to be a mother. And her confidence is not misplaced. What-

ever others may think, Elisabeth greets her as *Blessed* (εὐλογημένη, favoured by God), and with quick intuition—with a Divine inspiration of sympathy—pours out impassioned words of joy and of reverent congratulation for the young Maiden who is to realize at last the dream of every Jewish woman of the house of David, by becoming the Mother of the national Deliverer, the long-looked-for Messiah. And then the gladness of being understood,<sup>1</sup> of being believed, breaks out into humble thanksgiving to God who has counted her worthy of so great a destiny. “And Mary said, *Magnificat*.” To place *Magnificat* in the mouth of Elisabeth at this point would be prosaic indeed.

## II.

It has sometimes been thought that the Evangelist intends to represent the Virgin as giving utterance to this hymn of praise in a moment of prophetic or poetic inspiration, and, as it were, *extempore*. Such a view is, no doubt, possible, although it is not easy to understand how an extemporaneous thanksgiving could be afterwards recalled to memory and actually recorded. In moments of deep emotion, men and women are apt to express themselves more eloquently and more poetically than is their wont in the ordinary affairs of life.<sup>2</sup> The warnings and promises of the prophets are as often clothed in the language of poetry as in the language of prose; and, indeed, in Hebrew it is not easy to distinguish between impassioned prose and poetry. We may grant that it is possible—although, surely, it is improbable—that *Magnificat* was the spontaneous outpouring of a thankful heart, stirred to its depths by a marvellous experience of God's favour. But, at any rate, St. Luke does not say that it was so. His statement is simply that the Hymn which we call *Magnificat* was Mary's response to the greeting of Elisabeth; he does

<sup>1</sup> This is well brought out by Lange, *The Life of Christ*, vol. i. p. 368 ff. Engl. (Transl.). <sup>2</sup> Cp. 1 Cor. xiv. for prophetic utterances of this kind.

not say that it was an original composition of her own, or used by her for the first time.

We must examine the piece to see whether it is like an *extempore* utterance or whether, like the best lyric poetry, it is constructed with due regard to rhythm and balance. And when we thus examine it, we can hardly doubt that the words of Mary's thanksgiving are the words of an existing hymn, which she applied—perhaps with the modification of a word here and there—to her own circumstances and her own destiny. The hymn is, in part, appropriate to others beside the Blessed Virgin, and thus most of it would not be out of place if spoken by Elisabeth, as some persons hold it was intended by St. Luke to be.

I am not, however, convinced by Dr. Harnack's reasoning that the hymn is St. Luke's own composition; for I see little to favour such a thought. It is not Luke's habit to invent speeches for the persons who come into his narrative; the speeches in the Acts are not like the speeches in Thucydides, which are obviously "made up" by the historian. St. Luke, on the other hand, ascribes the recitation of hymns of thanksgiving to Mary, to Zacharias, to Simeon, because he believes that they uttered them, not that he may add an artistic touch to his narrative. It is worth observing that he places no such hymn in the mouth of Anna the aged prophetess, although he tells that she, like Simeon, "gave thanks to God, and spake of Him to all them that were looking for the redemption of Jerusalem."<sup>1</sup> But St. Luke gives no hymn here; he only gives us hymns where he has learnt that they were actually used. And those that he has preserved for us have none of the characteristic marks of his own style; neither in language nor in thought are they in the least like the rest of his Gospel. They are no inventions or compositions of his.

The striking similarity of *Magnificat* to the Song of

<sup>1</sup> Luke ii. 38.



Hannah in 1 Samuel has, of course, been noticed by every careful reader. In both we have as the theme the reversal of the world's judgements, the overthrow of the mighty and of kingdoms, the satisfaction of the Hungry, the discomfiture of the Rich. The speaker in both cases is an expectant Mother who exults in the Divine Mercy which has been shown her, although one need not stay to emphasize the difference between the two cases. But the similarity in structure between the two Songs is so close as to suggest—what is in itself in no way improbable—that both are hymns in which Jewish women were accustomed to pour out their heart's thanksgiving. No race has ever thought more of the dignity and blessedness of Motherhood than did the Jewish race, and the eager expectation of Messiah, which was the root of all their national hopes, would be most keenly felt by the young mothers of Israel. That we may see how intensely Jewish is the Hymn of the Virgin it is only necessary to set down some parallels from the Old Testament to its beautiful phrases. These will show that there is no single phrase which was not familiar to every pious Jew.

- i. 46. *My heart rejoiceth in the Lord* is the opening phrase of the Song of Hannah ;<sup>1</sup> *I will rejoice in*
47. *the Lord, I will joy in the God of my salvation* is the climax of the prayer of Habakkuk.<sup>2</sup>
48. *If Thou wilt look on the affliction of thine handmaid*<sup>3</sup> was the prayer which Hannah prayed in her grief ; *the Lord hath respect unto the lowly* is the assurance of a Psalmist.<sup>4</sup>

*Happy am I, for the daughters will call me happy (or blessed)*<sup>5</sup> is Leah's exclamation of joy in the birth of a son, who though not her's would be counted as of her household.

<sup>1</sup> 1 Sam. ii. 1.    <sup>2</sup> Hab. iii. 18 ; Ps. xxxv. 9 ; Isa. xxv. 9, lxi. 10.

<sup>3</sup> 1 Sam. i. 11.    <sup>4</sup> Ps. cxlviii. 6.    <sup>5</sup> Gen. xxx. 13.

49. *The Lord hath done great things for us*<sup>1</sup> is the cry of one Psalmist ; *Holy and reverend is His Name*<sup>2</sup> is the call to adoration by another ;
50. *The mercy of the Lord is from everlasting to everlasting upon them that fear Him*<sup>3</sup> is the assurance of yet another.
51. *Put on strength, O arm of the Lord*<sup>4</sup> is a prophet's prayer. *Thou hast humbled the proud as one that is wounded : Thou hast scattered thine enemies with the arm of Thy strength*<sup>5</sup> is a verse from the Greek version of the 89th Psalm.
52. *He poureth contempt upon princes* :<sup>6</sup> *He overthroweth the mighty* :<sup>7</sup> *He setteth up on high those that be low* ;<sup>8</sup> these are phrases from the Book of Job.
53. *He filleth the hungry soul with goodness*<sup>9</sup> is from the Psalter ; *The Lord maketh poor and maketh rich ; He bringeth low, He also lifteth up*<sup>10</sup> is, again, from the Song of Hannah.
54. *He hath remembered His mercy and His faithfulness towards the house of Israel* is from the 98th Psalm<sup>11</sup> ; *Thou wilt perform the truth to Jacob and the mercy to Abraham which Thou hast sworn unto our fathers from the days of old*<sup>12</sup> is from the prophet Micah.

It is quite clear that *Magnificat* is a *canto* from the Old Testament. There is no distinctly Christian phrase in it, although every phrase is suggestive of a Christian meaning. Other parallels have been found to its language in the Sacred Songs of the Jews, gathered in the remarkable

<sup>1</sup> Ps. cxxvi. 3.<sup>2</sup> Ps. cxi. 9 ; cp. Isa. lvii. 15.<sup>3</sup> Ps. ciii. 17.<sup>4</sup> Isa. li. 9.<sup>5</sup> Ps. lxxxix. 10.<sup>6</sup> Job xii. 21.<sup>7</sup> Job xii. 19 ; cp. Eccclus. x. 14.<sup>8</sup> Job v. 11.<sup>9</sup> Ps. cvii. 9.<sup>10</sup> 1 Sam. ii. 7.<sup>11</sup> Ps. xcvi. 3 ; cp. Isa. xli. 8.<sup>12</sup> Mic. vii. 20.

collection which was called the Psalter of Solomon.<sup>1</sup> And Dr. Chase has suggested parallels from the ancient Prayers of the Synagogue.<sup>2</sup> That is not surprising, for all alike have their roots in the Old Testament. The Advent Canticles of the Christian Church are the last notes of Hebrew song ; they mark the moment of transition from Old Testament to New Testament, from the Law to the Gospel, from the Promises of Hope to their Consummation in Grace.

### III.

But it is time to analyse the Hymn itself, and to seek to discover its leading thoughts. Hebrew poetry—and whether *Magnificat* was originally written in Hebrew or not,<sup>3</sup> it is constructed after the model of a Hebrew Psalm—was marked by attention to rhythm and the balance and parallelism of clauses, and not by rhyme or what we call metre. Now the balance of repetition of clauses in *Magnificat* is plain enough. *My soul doth magnify the Lord—My spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour*, the second clause repeating the thought of the first, of thanksgiving to Jehovah, the Saviour of Israel, whom Mary takes for her own. “God, my Saviour” would be referred by a Christian to our Lord ; and we cannot tell with what joyful premonitions of the future Mary may have used it ; but the phrase is frequent in the Psalter of Solomon, and generally is used in connexion with mercies shown by Jehovah to the nation. Then comes a single line, giving the reason of the rejoicing :

*For He hath had respect to the lowliness of His hand-  
maiden.*

The strain of joy rises higher :

<sup>1</sup> See Ryle and James, *The Psalms of Solomon*, p. xci.

<sup>2</sup> Chase, *The Lord's Prayer in the Early Church*, p. 147.

<sup>3</sup> That *Magnificat* seems to reproduce the language of the LXX does not determine the matter, for the Greek translator (if the hymn be a translation) would naturally use the LXX, as we see in the Psalms of Solomon.

*All generations shall call me happy.*

*The Mighty One hath done great things to me.*

*Holy is His Name.*

And then at the end of the first stanza we have the keynote of *Magnificat*:

*His MERCY is on them that fear Him throughout all generations.*

This is the master thought; to this all leads up, and the thought is repeated, with glowing memories of the past, at the end of the second stanza:

*He hath holpen Israel His servant . . .*

*that He might remember MERCY to Abraham and his seed for ever.*

MERCY is the keyword. In the first stanza the singer praises God for His overwhelming Mercy which rests upon her, as it will upon all who fear Him, for ever. She sings of personal mercies, and that with no loud protestations, but with a humble thanksgiving which is sacred indeed. And then, in the second stanza, the hymn bursts out uncontrollably—as it seems—into a paean of national hope; the usurping overlords of Palestine are scattered; the mighty Roman governors are humbled; the downtrodden Jew has come to his own again. And all this because of the Divine Mercy which has never failed throughout the years of oppression—the Mercy promised in the far off past.

*Mercy* is the keyword of *Magnificat*. And as in so many of the Psalms, the devotion which begins with thoughts of self and of God's mercy to the individual issues in a larger and more generous thanksgiving for His mercy to the nation and to the Church which He has taken for His own.

The meaning of *Magnificat* is missed if it is sung to music which does not recognize this structure. It is in two stanzas, and both lead up to the same thought—of mercy. In the first stanza the individual is rejoicing in patient humility;

this is not to be sung with the crash of a full chorus. The second stanza breaks out into a triumphant *fortissimo* of praise ; and there is no good reason in the thoughts which it suggests for the habit which musical composers often have of ending with a faint and timid rehearsal of the promise to Abraham and his seed.<sup>1</sup>

## IV.

The Song of the Blessed Virgin Mary is a Song of the Christian Church. It has been sung in daily public worship for nearly 1,400 years, and the place which it occupies in the service of Evensong, between the reading of the Old Testament and New Testament, has a special appropriateness as we recall its occasion and its meaning. The Virgin looked back in thankfulness upon the promises to ancient Israel, and looked forward in trembling hope to the fulfilment which they were to receive. We too, as we hear the Old Testament read, feel that it is incomplete without the New Testament. It points onward to the Christ and His Kingdom. And of this *Magnificat* speaks. The Decline and Fall of the Empires of which the Hebrew prophets tell, are but illustrations and instances of that perpetual reversal of the world's judgements by God, which is so emphatically set forth in the Sermon on the Mount.

*He hath scattered the proud. . . . Blessed are the poor  
in spirit.*

<sup>1</sup> The difference in thought between *Magnificat* and *Cantate Domino*, which is the alternative Canticle for Evensong in the services of the Church of England, is chiefly to be seen in this twofold structure of *Magnificat*, personal rejoicing first—national afterwards. In *Cantate Domino* (the 98th Psalm), we have in the first four verses most of the characteristic expressions of *Magnificat* ; that, of course, is the reason why it was selected as an alternative. "The Lord hath done *marvellous things . . . with His holy arm . . .* He hath declared *His salvation . . .* He hath remembered His *mercy* towards the house of Israel." But this is all *fortissimo*, and the more subdued rejoicing of a thankful heart for personal mercies finds no place in its jubilant phrases.



*He hath exalted the humble and meek. . . . Blessed are the meek.*

*He hath filled the hungry. . . . Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled.*

The Beatitudes re-echo the phrases of *Magnificat*, and fill them with a more spiritual meaning. The contrast between the proud and the humble is the perpetual theme of both Old Testament and New Testament; even as the spirit which can see God's mercy in His judgements no less than in His favours is in both commended as blessed. And as *Magnificat*, with its hopes of securing salvation, its faith in the Divine *mercy*, is the daily hymn of the Church, so the daily prayer of the Church for each soul is, *O Lord, shew Thy mercy upon us : And grant us Thy salvation.*

J. H. BERNARD.

### LUCAN *VERSUS* JOHANNINE CHRONOLOGY.

THE only New Testament writer who confronts his task as a historian, aiming to present the origins of Christianity in their proper sequence and their relation to the larger world-order, is St. Luke. It is natural that we should find several direct attempts in his two-fold treatise to correlate the events narrated with secular history, besides the occasional undesigned points of contact. These, however, do not exactly bear out Professor Ramsay's classification of St. Luke as a historian along with Tacitus and Thucydides. In spite of some very laboured defences, it is the general verdict of impartial historical criticism that in identifying the census of Luke ii. 1 with that of Quirinius (v. 2), taken at the deposition of Archelaus in A.D. 6, and again referred to in Acts v. 37, he has shown himself capable of decided con-

fusion.<sup>1</sup> The same judgment applies to his identification of the famine predicted by Agabus with an alleged world-wide famine "in the days of Claudius" (Acts xi. 28). The famine in question being admittedly that which prevailed in *Judaea* in A.D. 46-48,<sup>2</sup> it was both several years after the death of Agrippa (Acts xii.) and not to be identified either with the assiduae sterilitates which, according to Suetonius,<sup>3</sup> characterized the reign of Claudius, nor the famine in Rome 51 A.D.,<sup>4</sup> made memorable by the great harbour works erected to prevent a recurrence. As to the historical references of the speech put in the mouth of Gamaliel (Acts v. 36 f.) the anachronisms are hopeless.

There is, however, but one fully reckoned out *date* in the entire work, and the uniqueness of this, together with the elaborateness with which it is calculated by the current method of synchronisms, are proof that the author regarded it as both fundamental and sufficient. From the position St. Luke has given to this carefully elaborated date the year it defines can be no other than the epoch-making year *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, the year of grace, or, as designated in the programmatic address of Jesus at Nazareth,<sup>5</sup> "the acceptable year of the Lord." Down to the time of Eusebius this was the universal understanding of the Lucan chronology, both among orthodox and heretics, so that even on the appearance of the Fourth Gospel, with its extension of the ministry over several passovers, those who maintained on this ground that admission of the Johannine writings set "the Gospels at variance" were not opposed by any change in the traditional interpretation of Luke. Save for the curious exceptions here-

<sup>1</sup> See, however, the article "Die chronologischen Notizen und die Hymnen in Lc. 1 u. 2," by Fr. Spitta in *Zts. f. nt. Wiss.* vii. 4 (Dec. 1906), where only the redactor is made responsible for the confusion. The source placed the nativity about B.C. 4-3, when a census was really taken by Quirinius.

<sup>2</sup> Jos. *Ant.* XX. i. 1, 2; ii. 1, 5; v. 1, 2; *B. J.* II. xii. 1.

<sup>3</sup> *Claud.* 18. <sup>4</sup> Tacitus, *Ann.* xii. 43.

<sup>5</sup> Luke iv. 19.

inafter to be mentioned harmonists only maintained that "It is evident that the three evangelists recorded only the deeds done by the Saviour for one year after the imprisonment of John the Baptist . . . but John in his Gospel records the deeds of Christ which were performed before the Baptist was cast into prison."<sup>1</sup> The one-year ministry is therefore part and parcel of the Lucan chronology. The ridicule poured by Irenaeus on Gnostic number symbolism attached to the thirty years of Jesus' age at baptism and the twelve months of the ministry, with his own extravagant extension of it to a period of twenty years, are only the exception which proves the rule.<sup>2</sup> The Lucan chronology was not only dominant in the Church, but among Gnostics as well, among whom Clement of Alexandria enables us to name specifically Basilides himself,<sup>3</sup> whose *Ἐξηγήτικα* date back to ca. 133. And the implication of a one-year ministry is so universal and so persistent in its acceptance, even in face of the Johannine tradition, that we cannot but assume that Gnostic exegesis was at least correct to the extent of maintaining that Luke iv. 19 conveyed the evangelists' own understanding of the duration of the ministry.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Eus. *H. E.* III. xxiv. The whole chapter is a defence of the Fourth Gospel against the charge of being "at variance with" the rest. The unnamed opponent is probably Gaius, whose *Dialogue* against the Montanist Proclus was in Eusebius' hands. In this work the *διαφωνία* of the Fourth Gospel with the rest in respect to the duration of the ministry was urged as a ground for its rejection. Irenaeus and Hippolytus confront the same, as well as the *Fragm. Murat.*

<sup>2</sup> *Her.* II. xxii. For an exception of almost equal interest see the chronographic fragment of Dobschütz, *T. u. U.* xi. 1, p. 136 ff. The author is Alexander of Jerusalem (218 A.D.), though claiming to transcribe from "Apostolic documents." The effort is to harmonize the Lucan and Johannine chronologies by applying the 12 years period before the Dispersion of the Twelve (*Ker. Petri ap. Clem. Al. Strom.* vi. 5) to the duration of the ministry.

<sup>3</sup> *Strom.* i. 145 f.

<sup>4</sup> On the one-year ministry as a tradition "too well grounded to be easily displaced" by that of the Fourth Gospel, see Drummond, *Char. and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 47, with note referring to the "great

2. The great Paschal Controversy, coincident in its first outbreak (ca. 154) with efforts in the secular world to reform the calendar and methods of dating, led first in Palestine, afterwards at Rome,<sup>1</sup> to various attempts at an absolute chronology, which culminated in the great chronological work of Hippolytus of Rome on the Paschal Cycle, published A.D. 234. In all of these the point of departure seems to be the sixteenth year of Tiberius, or "year of the two Gemini,"<sup>2</sup> for the Crucifixion=29 A.D. This is almost certainly taken from Luke iii. 1, where the beginning of the ministry is placed in Tiberius xv.<sup>3</sup> In all probability this was a substantially correct understanding, and St. Luke himself regarded the year of redemption as beginning between passover A.D. 28 and passover A.D. 29, if not at the former date precisely.

3. Unless modern authorities are wrong in regarding John ii. 20 as intended to fix the date of the beginning of the ministry by synchronism with the building of the temple, this understanding of the absolute chronology of St. Luke is confirmed and the consequent date *for the crucifixion* accepted by our Fourth Evangelist. The duration of the ministry is extended in John to cover a period of exactly two years, so that beginning with a passover at Jerusalem, at which Jesus publicly assumes His Messianic office (ii.

number of references to writers who limited the ministry to one year" in Ezra Abbott: *Authorship of the Fourth Gospel: External Evidence*, Boston, 1880, p. 73, note.

<sup>1</sup> Eus. *H.E.* V. xxiii.-xxv.

<sup>2</sup> I.e. of the consuls L. Rubellius Geminus and C. Fufius (or Rufius, or Rufus, or Fusius) Geminus=29 A.D.

<sup>3</sup> St. Luke may date from the actual beginning of Tiberius' reign, Aug. 9, A.D. 14, or, more probably, as Josephus does, from Passover, as the beginning of the year, making Tiberius xv.=April A.D. 28-Aug. A.D. 29. At all events the year would be understood by second century chronographers, who date by consulships, as beginning Jan. 1, so that the year of the Crucifixion, 29 A.D. (=Tiberius xvi.) would correspond to their understanding of Luke iii. 1. Cf. Turner, Hastings' *B.D.* s.v. "Chronology," p. 413b.

13-22), its earlier half, in Galilee and Samaria, is concluded at a second (vi. 4), and its later, in Judaea and Peraea, at a third, when the crucifixion occurs coincidentally with the slaying of the passover lamb. Thus the incident of the Cleansing of the Temple, removed from its position in Synoptic narrative, comes to occupy with relation to the chronology a place corresponding in prominence to the synchronisms of Luke iii. 1, followed by the address in Nazareth (Luke iv. 16 ff.). The painstaking necessary to establish this year as the forty-seventh from the inception of Herod's enterprise is evidence of the importance attached by the Evangelist to the date. Calculation of the synchronism in question gives A.D. 27,<sup>1</sup> so that the "year of the two Gemini" again appears as that of the crucifixion. Thus the Lucan absolute dating is accepted, while his relative dating, involving the two features developed by Basilides in his symbolism of numbers, the twelve-month of the ministry, and the thirty years of Jesus' age, is tacitly but firmly set aside.

If the reckoning of St. Luke can in this instance withstand the tests of criticism, it will be reasonable to hold that it, if not the Johannine synchronism as well, is based on actual historical tradition of the correct date.<sup>2</sup> If for any reason it prove inadmissible, not only the patristic absolute chronologies worked out from "the year of the two Gemini" fall with it, but that of the Fourth Gospel as well, which here as elsewhere will have evinced its erroneous dependence upon St. Luke.<sup>3</sup>

4. Since the time of the astronomer Wurm repeated attempts have been made to determine the year of the crucifixion astronomically by eliminating all years in which neither

<sup>1</sup> See Turner, *ibid.* p. 405b. The year of Herod's undertaking to build the temple would seem to be B.C. 20-19.

<sup>2</sup> So e.g. Clemen, *Paulus*, i., "Chronologie," p. 393.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. John xi. 2, xii. 2, with Luke vii. 36-50, Mark xiv. 3-9.



Nisan 14 (the date according to John) nor Nisan 15 (the date according to the Synoptic tradition) could fall on a Friday, the correct day of the week according to all accounts. Nisan was always that lunation whose full-moon fell first after vernal equinox, and the date of this full-moon (properly Nisan 14) can be calculated within a few minutes of error for Jerusalem during all the period in question. Had the problem been merely to determine this (astronomic) full-moon, as recently assumed by Achelis,<sup>1</sup> the result would have been exceedingly simple. The year 29 would be wholly excluded; but the year 30 would meet the conditions on the supposition that the Fourth Gospel is correct. It is perfectly certain, however, from copious contemporary references<sup>2</sup> that the date of Passover (Nisan 14) was determined not by reckoning astronomically when the full-moon would be due, but by "sanctifying" as the first day of the month (and of the year) that day in the evening of which the slender sickle of the new-moon had been first actually observed. In case of failure to observe in time, from bad weather or otherwise, the "head of the year" was held to have been "sanctified in heaven." If the preceding month had had its full quota of thirty days, failure to observe would make no difference at all. If this had had only twenty-nine days, and bad weather prevented observation, the new moon (Nisan 1) might be twenty-four hours late and no more. It is obvious that the next moon would correct even this error, so that the margin of uncertainty is not wide. Moreover the allowance to be made on this account is partly cancelled by the margin we are compelled to allow for the divergence of Johannine from Synoptic tradition, since a delayed Nisan 14=Nisan 15.

<sup>1</sup> *Gött. gel. Nachr. phil. hist. Kl.* 1902, 707 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Not only the Talmudic sources in *Rosh ha-shanah*, but explicitly the fragment of the *Kerygma Petri ap. Clem. Al. Strom.* vi. 5 declares that the Jewish calendar was dependent on actual observation.

Besides the deduction to be made on this account certain years require the admission of two possible lunations for Nisan ; for if the 14th of the lunation in question fell very near equinox (Mar. 25 according to the current Julian calendar, erroneously for Mar. 23), the priests might call it Veadar, the intercalary month, assigning it to the preceding year, in which case the following lunation would be Nisan.

Tables having due regard to all these considerations have been prepared in recent years by Professor Fotheringham of Oxford,<sup>1</sup> by which it becomes possible to exclude absolutely certain years, because the new moon was *not visible* in time for either Nisan 14 or 15 in those years to have fallen on a Friday. Among these inadmissible years is "the Year of the two Gemini" A.D. 29, when Nisan 14 fell either on Sunday, March 20, or (if the next lunation was Nisan) on Tuesday, April 19. Inasmuch as not even the discredited method of Achelis succeeds in bringing this year within the bounds of possibility,<sup>2</sup> it may be set down as a mathematical certainty that the ancient chronographers were wrong in fixing upon it.<sup>3</sup> Fotheringham is doubtless correct in accounting for its origin as follows :—

*Spring Equinox* = *March 25* or *March 18* is a synchronism following from the Julian Calendar, where the former is given as the date of the equinox, the latter as the date of the entrance of the sun into Aries. But the crucifixion was notoriously at the season of Passover. Therefore March 25 or March 18 is the natural date for it to one who used the Julian Calendar. All other early dates, with two exceptions, are within the range of calendar dates for the spring equinox. . . . The two exceptions are the Basilidian dates, apparently the less favoured Basilidian dates, April 20 and April 14 ; but they are

<sup>1</sup> *Journal of Philology*, 1903, 100 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Achelis makes Nisan 14 A.D. 29 to fall on Sunday, April 17, whether reckoning by astronomic full-moon or by phasis, assuming the latter to occur thirty-six hours after conjunction. The assumption is incorrect, but in this case does not affect the result.

<sup>3</sup> Turner, in his able article "Chronology" in the *Hastings B. D.*, fixes upon this year, but does not succeed in reconciling it with astronomical data.

apparently connected with the "dies Aegyptiaci," and are therefore artificial. Now 29 and 35 are the only dates at all conceivable, in which March 25 was a Friday; therefore the date March 25 [or March 18] carries with it 29 A.D.; and this date had the additional advantage that both the cycle of Hippolytus and the Roman 84 years' cycle would give March 25 as the date of Good Friday in 29 A.D.<sup>1</sup>

In his fuller statement of the following year<sup>2</sup> Fotheringham supplies the link which was lacking to make the proof conclusive of the artificial origin of the patristic dates, March 18 or March 25, 29 A.D.<sup>3</sup> It was certainly "natural" for churches which continued to celebrate the feast of the full-moon of spring equinox<sup>4</sup> as the anniversary of the Passion, calling it "the true Passover of the Lord's death," and declaring their purpose to be "nothing else than to celebrate the memory of His Passion, and at the very date which those who were eyewitnesses from the beginning have handed down,"<sup>5</sup> to determine this date, once they were no longer under control of the Jewish priestly calendar of feasts, by the Julian calendar, just as we ourselves celebrate the Nativity annually on December 25, the *Dies Natalis invicti solis* of the same calendar. But the "natural" in this case is fortunately attested to be also the historical, not only by Epiphanius<sup>6</sup> regarding churches of Cappadocia, but by the Magdeburg centuriators among those of Gaul as well.<sup>7</sup> Therefore when Alexander of Jerusalem in 218 A.D. gives March 25 as the true date of the Resurrection, and

<sup>1</sup> *Abstract of Proceedings of the Society of Historical Theology*, Oxford, 1901-1902, p. 40.

<sup>2</sup> *Journal of Philology*, p. 116.

<sup>3</sup> The *Acts of Pilate* have in some editions March 25, in others March 18.

<sup>4</sup> Called "Quartodeciman" from their observance of the "fourteenth" (Nisan) instead of the day of the (Easter) week. From A.D. 150-200 this was the almost universal practice of the East, and was known even in Gaul.

<sup>5</sup> *Chron. Pasch.* 7, 6.

<sup>6</sup> *Panher.* i. 1 and 1.

<sup>7</sup> *Magd. Cent.* ii. 118, 56.

claims to be transcribing "apostolic documents,"<sup>1</sup> he need not be accused of conscious deception, but only attests the antiquity of this date. The churches of Cappadocia may well have continued the practice of the pre-Christian synagogue in these regions in their celebration of the passover by absolute (Julian) dating.

5. There remains no room to doubt that "the year of the two Gemini" is incorrect and artificial. The question that ensues is whether the patristic understanding of St. Luke was correct, so that the chronology on which all have built, including as it would seem our fourth Evangelist as well, merely anticipated the second century chronographers in looking up in the current calendars the year in which March 25 (or March 18) fell on a Friday.

If astronomical calculation could exclude the year 30 as well as 29, the probability would be very strong that such was the actual origin of the Lucan chronology; for outside of 30 the only admissible years, according to Fotheringham's tables, are either much too early or much too late to agree with the datum Tiberius xv. of Luke iii. 1,<sup>2</sup> implying Tiberius xvi. for the crucifixion. But if it occurred on Nisan 14 (so the Fourth Gospel), A.D. 30 becomes a possible year. Fotheringham says indeed, "In the case of 30 the (astronomical) conditions are so pronouncedly in favour of a late phasis that it would be difficult to adopt an earlier date" for Nisan 14 than Saturday, April 8. Nevertheless

<sup>1</sup> Dobschütz in *T. u. U.* xi. 1, p. 136 ff. The fragment contains a curious chronology aiming to reconcile the Johannine with the Lucan, extending the ministry to twelve years (traditional period of the offer of the gospel to Israel in *Ker. Petri ap. Clem. Al. Strom.* vi. 5), and the life of Jesus from A.D. 9 to A.D. 58 (i.e. 49 years; cf. John viii. 53). The fact that March 25 in A.D. 58 was *not* a Friday proves the independence of this date from the rest of the chronology.

<sup>2</sup> Attempts have been made to reckon the year Tiberius xv. from A.D. 11, when Tiberius was made co-ordinate in the provinces with Augustus, or 13 when he received the Tribunician power (which he had held for years previously) for life. These are very improbable.



Friday, April 7, is not impossible,<sup>1</sup> and the Johannine date Nisan 14 is more probable than the Synoptic Nisan 15. A.D. 33 is perhaps more probable astronomically, and A.D. 34 more probable still. But we must reckon with the possibility that in Luke iii. 1, if not in John ii. 20 also, A.D. 30 was contemplated as the year of the crucifixion, and that at least the former Evangelist may have had the date by real historical tradition.

6. The absolute chronology of the Fourth Gospel is certainly coincident with, if not dependent on, the Lucan. Windisch has recently shown<sup>2</sup> that Basilides probably based his twenty-four books of *ἐξηγήτικα* on St. Luke's Gospel as edited by himself, thus anticipating Marcion. The fact is best accounted for by the derivation of both the Alexandrian school of Gnosticism and the Roman (through Cerdon) from Antioch, the traditional place of origin of the Lucan writings. But Basilides does not appear to have built on anything but the relative chronology of St. Luke, though his followers celebrated the baptism on the 15th Tybi, and declared it to have occurred in the 15th year of Tiberius.<sup>3</sup> The relative chronology was employed in the Basilidian system, and Irenaeus devotes much space to a refutation of the arguments of Ptolemaeus based on the thirty years from the nativity to the baptism, and the twelve months from the baptism to the resurrection,<sup>4</sup> adducing (*a*) the "three" passovers mentioned in the Fourth Gospel,<sup>5</sup> (*b*) the age

<sup>1</sup> The case cited on p. 106 *ibid.* in a note appended "since this article was written" of the new moon of 3.49 a.m., Mar. 29, 1903, seen by Mr. C. H. Thompson at Damascus on the evening of *the same day*, was not more favourable astronomically for early observation than that of 8 p.m., Mar. 22, A.D. 30, which Fotheringham thinks could hardly have been observed until the evening of Mar. 25.

<sup>2</sup> *Zts. nt. W.* vii. (1906), p. 240.

<sup>3</sup> *Cl. Al. Strom.* i. 21, 146.

<sup>4</sup> *Her.* II. xxii.

<sup>5</sup> Irenaeus seems to be at odds with his material (derived from Justin's *Syntagma* ?) in II. xxii. 3. For his second passover is that "on which he



which seems there to be attributed to Jesus. In both respects Irenaeus is certainly right in declaring the Fourth Gospel to be opposed to the Basilidian number symbolism; but in both he fails to do full justice to either side. As regards the Basilidians Drummond correctly points out that they were simply following the old tradition "too well grounded to be easily displaced" by the Fourth Gospel. For Basilides the Fourth Gospel had not yet appeared above the horizon, so that Irenaeus' marvel "how it has come to pass that . . . they have not examined the Gospels" is scarcely justified. As regards the Fourth Gospel Irenaeus miscounts the passovers, enumerating John ii. 23, v. 1, and xi. 54, instead of ii. 23, vi. 4, and xi. 54,<sup>1</sup> but his attempt to harmonize by extending the ministry over twenty years does not of course represent the method by which the fourth Evangelist himself would meet the contention of the Basilidians.

(a) It requires no great critical insight to understand the literary art of St. Luke in removing the scene of the preaching in the synagogue at Nazareth from the place it occupied in Mark, and setting it as a programmatic discourse at the opening of the ministry. Jesus thus appears in the spirit and power of the prophet, "proclaiming the acceptable year of the Lord" to Israel, foreshadowing also (ver. 24-29) the turning to the Gentiles which will result from their rejection of Him. With the procedure of St. Luke before us we should not be blind to the method of the fourth Evangelist in removing from its Synoptic setting the incident in which Jesus

cured the paralytic who had lain beside the pool 38 years" (John. v. 1 ff), after which he goes on to refer to his "withdrawing to the other side of the sea of Tiberius and feeding the multitude there," but *without counting this Passover* (John. vi. 4), and finally declares that of John xi. 54, xii. 1 to be the *third*. John. v. 1 ff. is really a Pentecost. Irenaeus perhaps preserves the numbering of his source, but applies it wrongly in the Gospel.

<sup>1</sup> See preceding note.

publicly assumes the Messianic office at the centre of Jewish worship, and in symbolic language announces the great sacrifice which is to do away with the "temple made with hands" (John ii. 13-22). If, then, in the same way that St. Luke had embodied in his scene of rejection in the synagogue at Nazareth his much debated reference to "the acceptable year of the Lord," our fourth Evangelist also, in his scene of rejection in the temple in Jerusalem, embodies his chronological data, he is likely to have given them intentionally this commanding position. It will also be with full intention that he has made the ministry cover exactly two years, one in Galilee and Samaria (ii. 13-vi. 4), the other in Judaea and Peraea (vii. 1-xi. 54). He could infer from Mark vi. 39 as well as moderns that the close of the Galilean ministry had been marked by a passover when Jesus had not gone to Jerusalem, even if he did not know, as was probably the historical fact, that the ministry did cover more than one year. Herein he corrects St. Luke, tacitly, after his manner, but justly, and yet without attaining a historical result; for the exact two-year period is manifestly more artificial than that of approximately one year. And to place the public assumption of the Messianic office, a throwing down of the gauntlet to the hierocracy, at the beginning instead of the end of the ministry violates all historical conditions.

(b) So with his representation of Jesus' age. Possibly he may not intend to suggest in ii. 21 that Jesus was then in His forty-seventh year, as was inferred by some early interpreters,<sup>1</sup> and as is believed by several modern authorities; but beyond all question Irenaeus was right in maintaining

<sup>1</sup> *De mont. Sina et Sion*, 4, ap. Cyprian, ed. Hartel, iii. 108. Augustine (*de Doctr. Christ.* ii. 28) refers to errorists (affected by the arguments of Gaius?), who made the age of Jesus forty-six "because the temple was said by the Jews to have been built in that number of years." See Loisy, *Quatrième Evangile*, p. 293, who himself adopts this interpretation of John ii. 21.

that John viii. 57 is out of all harmony with the idea of "about thirty years" as the age of Jesus.<sup>1</sup> Irenaeus himself has contributed an important item to our understanding of the matter in the endeavour to support his interpretation of the passage. From "the elders" quoted by Papias<sup>2</sup> he reports a tradition that Jesus "when He taught" had reached the age which befits the teacher, viz. forty years; for the words "and fiftieth" in the phrase "but from the fortieth and fiftieth year a man begins to decline towards old age" are manifestly an insertion of Irenaeus' own to adapt the tradition to his exegesis of John viii. 57.<sup>3</sup> According to the preceding paragraph Jesus was baptized at thirty. "He came to Jerusalem (John ii. 13-22) when He had attained the full age of a teacher (*magistri*), so that He might properly be listened to by all as a teacher." The allusion is to the requirement attested in *Aboda Zara: Ad quodnam vero aetatis momentum expectandum est antequam vir doctus alios docere possit?* Resp. *Ad exactos annos quadraginta.*<sup>4</sup> The ancient tradition was a vindication of Jesus' right to the title and office of Rabbi, as having reached, when He began to teach, the full required age of forty years. It is not so much Johannine as Lucan, or rather pre-Lucan, since while demonstrable in one of the sources of St. Luke and probably implied also in Matthew, it has been superseded in the

<sup>1</sup> *Her.* II. xxii. 4, 5.

<sup>2</sup> *Her.* II. xxii. 5. A quadragesimo et (var. aut) quinquagesimo anno declinat jam in aetatem seniore, quam habens Dominus noster docebat, sicut evangelium καὶ πάντες οἱ πρεσβύτεροι μαρτυροῦσιν οἱ κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν Ἰωάννη τῷ τοῦ Κυρίου μαθητῇ συμβεβληκότες, παραδεδοκέναι ταῦτα τὸν Ἰωάννην. The written testimony of Papias is implied by the present μαρτυροῦσιν. Irenaeus wishes here, as in V. xxxiii. 4, to add the written authority of Papias, whose preface he interprets as meaning that Papias was himself a hearer of the Apostles Andrew, Peter, Philip, etc., to the oral of "the Elder John" whom Papias was here quoting.

<sup>3</sup> Corssen, supported by Drummond (*op. cit.* p. 252), proposes to strike out "et (aut) quinquagesimo" from the text of *Irenaeus*. This is simply to obliterate the evidence instead of interpreting it.

<sup>4</sup> *Bab. Talm.* ed. Frankfort, 1715, fol. 19b, quoted by Schoettgen.

canonical Third Gospel by the thirty-year dating. In Acts vii. 23 "the prophet" who prefigures Jesus is declared *without any Old Testament authority* to have "visited His brethren the children of Israel when He had fully attained the age of forty years."<sup>1</sup> Probably a similar age is intended in the birth stories of Matthew and Luke when the nativity is set "in the days of Herod the king." The Fourth Gospel accordingly is not more arbitrary in reverting to this older tradition of Jesus' age, than in correcting St. Luke on the duration of the ministry, and all the Synoptics on the date of the crucifixion. Only it carries its correction to an exaggerated degree, presenting at least the suggestion, on which Irenaeus and some contemporary and later chronographers have built, that Jesus' "glorification" was not until His forty-ninth or Jubilee year.

7. The evidence of the Johannine chronology in comparison with the Lucan justifies in some measure the view that an independent and in its nucleus a historical tradition underlies the divergences of the Fourth Gospel from the Synoptic type. In respect to the occurrence of the crucifixion on Nisan 14 rather than Nisan 15, this is now very widely acknowledged. The tendency is to acknowledge also a nearer approach to the facts in the two-year than in the one-year duration of the ministry. The present discussion should tend to show that on the point also of Jesus' age when He began to teach, the Fourth Gospel has independent and older authority than the chronology of Luke, in at least partial justification of its representations.

On the other hand, an impartial consideration of the changes wrought in the Lucan chronology, at just the points on which Basilides had built up his system of number symbolism, makes it probable that a counter-symbolism has been the really determinant factor. The Fourth Gospel, as

<sup>1</sup> So the Greek literally.



we saw, had not yet appeared above the horizon of Basilides. But had not Basilides already appeared above the horizon of the Fourth Gospel?

BENJ. W. BACON.

*THE NUMBER OF THE BEAST: A WARNING  
AGAINST MITHRAS WORSHIP.*

THE text (Apoc. xiii. 18) in Codex Alexandrinus reads : καὶ ὁ ἀριθμὸς αὐτοῦ ἑξακόσιοι ἑξήκοντα ἕξ. Codex Vaticanus has the same number 666 written with the three letters χξϞ. Codex  $\aleph$  has the variant ἑξακόσιαι. Codex Ephraemi (C) reads ἑξακόσια δέκα ἕξ, 616, with Cod. 11 of unknown date in the library of Petavius. This alternative reading was known to Irenaeus at the end of the second century,<sup>1</sup> and has been accepted by Zahn, Holtzmann, and Spitta.<sup>2</sup> Irenaeus himself rejected it, accepting the witness of those who saw John face to face.

Irenaeus had learnt from them that the number of the beast, κατὰ τὸν τῶν Ἑλλήνων ψῆφον διὰ τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ γραμμάτων, was sexcentos et sexaginta et sex ; and then he adds (the Greek text is lost) : “ hoc est, decadas aequales hecatontasin, et hecacontadas aequales monasin.” Some authorities left out five decads from the middle figure : “ Ignoro quomodo erraverunt quidam sequentes idiotismum, et medium frustrantes numerum nominis, quinquaginta numeros deducentes, pro sex decadis unam decadem volentes esse.” He thinks it may be the fault of the MSS. :—“ Scriptorum peccatum, ut solet fieri”—since the numbers were represented by letters, and it was easy to alter the Greek letter which stood for 60 “into an Iota,”—“in Iota.” Once the mistake was made, some adopted it without inquiry ; others usurped

<sup>1</sup> Iren. c. Haer. V. xxx. 1.      <sup>2</sup> Encyc. Bibl. p. 210.



the "denarium," i.e. the 10; others, again, in their ignorance, dared to seek out the names corresponding to the false number. The former may receive pardon from God; the latter deceive themselves and others. These must learn the true number of the name, that they be not numbered among the false prophets.

Irenaeus starts with the assumption that the number 666 represents the name of Antichrist: "hunc vere cognoscere esse abominationem desolationis. Hoc et Apostolus ait: Cum dixerint Pax, et munitio, tunc subitaneus illis superveniet interitus" (1 Thess. v. 3). He supports it by a prophecy of Jeremiah on Dan: "et veniet et manducabit terram et plenitudinem ejus et civitatem, et qui habitant in ea" (Jer. viii. 16). For this reason the tribe of Dan is omitted from the number of those who were sealed unto salvation (Apoc. vii. 5).<sup>1</sup>

"Certius ergo et sine periculo est, sustinere adimpletionem prophetiae, quam suspicari et divinare nomina quaelibet." But though this is the safe course, he frames his inquiry, "propter timorem erga Deum et zelum veritatis." He then refers to three names. The first is *ETANΘΑΣ*: "sed nihil de eo affirmamus." The second is *ΛΑΤΕΙΝΟΣ*. He is drawn to it because it is the last kingdom: "valde verisimile est, quoniam novissimum Regnum hoc habet vocabulum. Latini enim sunt qui nunc regnant: sed non in hoc nos gloriabimur."

It then continues: "Sed et *TEITAN*, prima syllaba per duas Graecas vocales e et i scripta, omnium nominum quae apud nos inveniuntur, magis fide dignum est." It agrees with the number: "Etenim praedictum numerum habet in se." It is of six letters: "et literarum est sex, singulis syllabis ex ternis literis constantibus." It is ancient and uncommon: "et vetus et semotum." It is

<sup>1</sup> Iren. c. *Haer.* V. xxx. 3.

the name of no king: "neque enim eorum Regum, qui secundum nos sunt, aliquis vocatus est Titan." It is the name of no idol among either the Greeks or barbarians: "neque eorum, quae publice adorantur, idolorum apud Graecos et barbaros habet vocabulum hoc." The reference to public worship is important. The name was borne by none of the recognized divinities of Greek or Barbarian worship. Yet the name is divine: "et divinum putatur apud multos esse hoc nomen, ut etiam sol Titan vocetur ab his qui nunc tenent" (i.e. imperant). He concludes: "tamen habet verisimilitudinem, ut ex multis colligamus ne forte Titan vocetur qui veniet."<sup>1</sup> He will not do more than suggest it. If he who wrote the Apocalypse kept it dark, the time to reveal it had not come. Nor is it long since he wrote: οὐδὲ γὰρ πρὸ πολλοῦ χρόνου ἐωράθη, ἀλλὰ σχεδὸν ἐπὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας γενεᾶς, πρὸς τῷ τέλει τῆς Δομετιανοῦ ἀρχῆς.

In this discussion Irenaeus finds the fulfilment of anti-Christian worship in a cult which he characterizes by the uncommon name of Titan. It is a cult not recognized among the public cults of the Greeks and Barbarians. It is a cult which gives divine honour to the Sun. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that Irenaeus is referring to Mithras worship, the most typically anti-Christian of all the religions of the empire.

Irenaeus wrote his work on the Heresies between the years 181 and 189.<sup>2</sup> The last book, in which this inquiry is found, belongs to the latter end of the reign of Commodus (180-192). This Emperor was favourably disposed towards the Christians, many holding office at his court.<sup>3</sup> It was not, therefore, in the person of the Emperor that Irenaeus sought for the fulfilment of the dark signs of the Apocalypse:

<sup>1</sup> Iren. V. xxx. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Harnack, *Chron.* i. 320.

<sup>3</sup> Iren. c. *Haer.* IV. xxx. 1.

“neque enim eorum Regum, qui secundum nos sunt, aliquis vocatus est Titan.”<sup>1</sup> Commodus was vile enough, perhaps amongst the vilest of the Emperors, but he was not personally the foe of the Christians.

The progress of Mithraism in the West made rapid strides in the reign of Commodus : “Sous les Antonins, surtout depuis le règne de Commode, les preuves de leur présence se multiplient dans tous les pays. A la fin du ii<sup>e</sup>. siècle, on les célébrait à Ostée dans quatre temples au moins.”<sup>2</sup> These mysteries in honour of the Sun-God, Sol Invictus, were the most subtle obstacle to the Christian mysteries. They were celebrated in all the great military centres. They had the strongest influence where Christianity itself was strongest. They represented, therefore, at that period a great anti-Christian force. Tertullian says of Mithraism : “Mithras signat illic in frontibus milites suos : celebrat et panis oblationem, et imaginem resurrectionis inducit, et sub gladio redimit coronam. Habet et virgines, habet et continentes.”<sup>3</sup> The words : “Mithras signat illic in frontibus milite suos” may be compared with the words of the Apocalypse : καὶ ποιεῖ πάντα . . . ἵνα δώσιν αὐτοῖς χάραγμα ἐπὶ τὸ μέτωπον αὐτῶν (Apoc. xiii. 16). “Here is wisdom : he that hath understanding, let him reckon the number of the beast, for it is the number of a man : ἀριθμὸς γὰρ ἀνθρώπου ἐστίν· καὶ ὁ ἀριθμὸς αὐτοῦ ἑξακόσιοι ἑξήκοντα ἕξ. The αὐτοῦ may refer to ἀνθρώπου as well as to the θηρίου of the previous clause. Is there in this a reference to the representation of Mithras in the form of a youth with Phrygian cap on head, so familiar in the sculptures of the old Roman cities of the West ?

There is therefore some reason for thinking that at the close of the second century in the age of Irenaeus and Ter-

<sup>1</sup> Ibid. V. xxx. 3.      <sup>2</sup> *Les Mystères de Mithra*. F. Cumont, p. 33.

<sup>3</sup> Tert. *de Praeser*. c. xl.

tullian the Christian Church looked upon Mithras as an embodiment of Antichrist, and found in the name Titan the title of the Sun-God, the fulfilment of the number of the Beast. Is there ground for thinking that the Apocalyptic writer in the age of Domitian (81-96) had the same cult in view? The researches of Mons. Cumont enables this question to be answered in the affirmative.

Statius, who wrote about 80, refers to the figure of Mithras slaying the Bull as known in Rome at this time.

“Persei sub rapibus autri

Indignata sequi torquentem cornua Mithram.”

Stat. *Theb.* i. 717.<sup>1</sup>

But the most ancient dedication to Mithras is a bilingual inscription of the period of the Flavian Emperors (69-96). There is also in the British Museum a marble group of Mithras and the Bull set up by a slave of T. Claudius Livianus, who was Praefectus Praetorio under Trajan in 102.<sup>2</sup> The cult of Mithras was well established in Rome during the latter part of the first century.

This is the period at which the Apocalypse took its final shape. According to Apoc. xvii. 10, the Apocalypticist represents himself as writing under the sixth Emperor: *καὶ βασιλεῖς ἑπτὰ εἰσὶν οἱ πέντε ἔπεσαν, ὁ εἷς ἔστιν, ὁ ἄλλος οὐπω ἦλθεν*. The five were Augustus, Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, Nero. The sixth (not counting the rule of Galba, Vitellius, and Otho, who all reigned and died between June 9, 68, and April 15, 69) is Vespasian, who reigned from July 69, to June 79. The seventh is Titus, whose short reign, June 79 to September 81, is referred to in the words: *καὶ ὅταν ἔλθῃ ὀλίγον αὐτὸν δεῖ μέναι* (Apoc. xvii. 10).

One of the acts of Vespasian was to convert the Colossus of Nero into a statue of the Sun-God. This remained until the reign of Hadrian (117-138), when it was removed

<sup>1</sup> Cumont, *myst. de Mithr.*, p. 31.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 32.

to make room for the new Temple of Venus and Rome. This statue would be during the reign of Domitian, when the Apocalypse received its last touches in the city of Rome, a Titanic representation not only of the great persecutor, the Imperial Antichrist, but of the great anti-Christian system of Mithras worship.

Nor is this the only method in which the number of the Beast can be referred to Nero. The greatest monument of Vespasian in Rome is the Colosseum or Flavian amphitheatre, so called because it was erected immediately under the Colossus of Nero or the Sun-God. It must have given work to vast numbers of the poorer classes in Rome, the very classes in which Christianity was beginning to take root. Day after day their work lay beneath this Titanic statue. The Greek writer of the Apocalypse may have veiled the word Titan under his number 666; the Jews were equally ready to see that it read in Hebrew letters נרון קסר: Nero Caesar, the same number 666.

The last Apocalyptic editor was almost certainly at Rome. The same hand that wrote Ὡδε ἡ σοφία ἐστίν· ὁ ἔχων νοῦν ψηφισάτω τὸν ἀριθμὸν τοῦ θηρίου (Apoc. xiii. 18) wrote the passage referring to the Seven Hills: Ὡδε ὁ νοῦς ὁ ἔχων σοφίαν· αἰεπτὰ κεφαλὰ ἐπτὰ ὄρη εἰσὶν, ὅπου ἡ γυνὴ κάθηται ἐπ' αὐτῶν (Apoc. xvii. 9). It is an example of Jewish and Greek word-play at Rome under the reigns of Vespasian and Domitian, the period in which Mithraism as well as Christianity was slowly being established. It is probable that Revelation xvii. 11 is by the later hand under the reign of Domitian, the reign referred to by Irenaeus. Καὶ ὅταν ἔλθῃ ὀλίγον αὐτὸν δεῖ μέναι is a *vaticinium ex eventu* in reference to the short reign of the seventh king, Titus: καὶ τὸ θηρίον ὃ ἦν καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν καὶ αὐτὸς ὀγδοὺς ἐστίν, καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἐπτὰ ἐστίν. These last words refer to the legend of Nero *Redivivus*.



The writer of the Apocalypse gives expression to the popular expectation of the return of Nero. It is the head who is wounded to death and afterwards healed (Apoc. xiii. 3, 12, 14). He will come again from the abyss, and demand the worship and adoration of the people (Apoc. xvii. 8).<sup>1</sup> This idea rests on a historical basis. In the year 69 a Pseudo-Nero appeared in Asia Minor and Greece. In the reign of Titus (79-81) another Nero appeared on the Euphrates and was acknowledged by the Parthian king Artabanus. His name was Terentius Maximus. He was known in Asia Minor, and in face and voice and accomplishments closely resembled Nero. He went so far as to gather forces against Rome. After many negotiations he was handed over by the Parthian government to the Emperor Domitian.<sup>2</sup> Mommsen says of him: "The Nero of John is he who rose on the Euphrates under Vespasian, whom Artabanus recognized in the reign of Titus, and whom the Parthians in the year 88 delivered up to Domitian."<sup>3</sup> Bousset, under the year 88, speaks of a third Pseudo-Nero among the Parthians.<sup>4</sup> The constant terror of the return of Nero forms part of the historical framework of this vision of the Apocalypse.

Irenaeus in the reign of Commodus interprets the number not of the Emperor, but apparently of the spirit of the Antichrist centralized in the system of Mithraism. The Apocalyptic writer in the age of Domitian, while apparently cognizant of the *χάραγμα* of Mithraism among the slaves and traffickers of the Roman forum, combines with the new spirit of Antichrist the militant anti-Christian policy of *Nero Redivivus*. The two anti-Christian ideas were found combined in the Titan Sun-God, the Nero, who figured so prominently at the far end of the forum.

<sup>1</sup> *Encyc. Bibl.* p. 207

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 211.

<sup>3</sup> *Momm. Prov.* v. 521.

<sup>4</sup> *Eng. Bibl.* p. 211.

The number 616 still stands in need of explanation. The evidence of Codex C cannot be easily set aside; nor can the conclusions of Irenaeus be accepted without reserve. It is evident that there was a large body of witness for the number 616. Irenaeus gives voice to the predominant reading of the age of Domitian. He does not explain satisfactorily the reading 616.

No one had so nearly embodied the Antichrist of Daniel, i.e. the Antiochus Epiphanes of the Maccabaeic age, as Caius Caligula, the mad youth who thought himself the brother of Jupiter, and claimed for himself divine honours. In 39 he gave instructions to Petronius, the Governor of Syria, to enter Jerusalem with the Roman legions, and set up his statue in the Temple. The Jews flocked to the Governor, both at Ptolemais and at Tiberias, and begged him to use his influence to prevent the sacrilege. King Agrippa, the friend of Caius, at last went personally to Rome, and succeeded for the time in staying the hand of Caius. But the concession was confined to the Temple at Jerusalem, and then only for a time. He still had the statue in readiness when in January 41 he was murdered in the Cryptoportico on the Palatine by Chaerea.

It is this appearance of Antichrist in the person of Caius Caligula which underlies the Apocalypse of the Last Things in St. Matthew xxiv. 15: "Let him that readeth understand." There may also be an allusion to this terror in 2 Thessalonians ii. 3: "The Man of Sin, who sitteth in the Temple of God, showing himself that he is God."

The letters of *Γάιος καίσαρ* make up the number 616. It is for this reason among others that Holtzmann and Spitta recognize a Jewish Apocalypse of the age of Caius Caligula as the original of this portion of the Apocalypse of John.

The interpretation of Irenaeus at least suggests that not only in his time, but in the age of Domitian, the Church

under the number of the Beast uttered a solemn warning against Mithras worship as an embodiment of the spirit of Antichrist.

THOMAS BARNS.

*JOB.*

II.

WE are to picture Job, then, suddenly plunged into overwhelming misfortune, dark thoughts of God's mysterious providence surging in his soul, and his friends gathered around to comfort him, but speechless in their sympathy—his pain was so great. Seven days thus pass in silent sorrow. At length the warm touch of friendship unseals the fountain of the heart, and the sufferer opens his mouth, and pours forth his pent-up feelings. With consummate art the poet leads up to the inevitable crisis. A long-drawn wail in which Job curses his day, because it brought him forth to all this agony, and longs wistfully for death and Sheol, where "the wicked cease from troubling, and the weary are at rest," a hushed reference to the unnamed One who "has given light to him that is in misery, and life to the bitter in soul," and at length Job names God as the One who has "hid his way," and "set an hedge about him," so that he can turn neither this way nor that (iii. 23). Eliphaz' glowing visions of the blessedness of the man whom God hath chastened only drive him into bitter tauntings of God for His inexplicable cruelty. It is His arrows that are within him; His terrors that have "set themselves in array against him" (vi. 4). It is He that setteth a watch over him, as though he were the dragon of the deep (vii. 12). And all the while Job feels that he has given God no occasion for such treatment. All his life long he has kept "the words of the Holy One" (vi. 10). Therefore he feels himself fast falling away from his faith, "forsaking the fear of the

Almighty" (vi. 14). And at the end of the speech he breaks into indignant remonstrance with the Almighty. In bitter parody of the eighth Psalm he asks :

What is man, that thou shouldest magnify him,  
 And that thou shouldest set thine heart upon him,  
 That thou shouldest visit him every morning,  
 And try him every moment ?  
 How long wilt thou not look away from me,  
 Nor let me alone till I swallow down my spittle ?  
 If I have sinned, what do I against thee, thou watcher of men ?  
 Why hast thou set me up as a butt for thee,  
 So that I am 'become a burden in thy way ?<sup>1</sup>  
 Why dost thou not pardon my transgression, and take away  
     mine iniquity,  
 That I may lay me down in the dust,  
 Where thou wilt seek me diligently, but I shall be no more ?  
 (vii. 17 ff.)

The second of the friends, Bildad, is horror-stricken at Job's impiety, and appeals in awed tones to God's inflexible justice. But this only rouses Job to more daring invectives against the Almighty. God is supreme Arbiter of justice, indeed. But what if He be partial, or actually unjust, in His judgments ? Who then can put himself in the right with Him ? If they went to court together, there was no daysman to stand between them, and see justice done. And if God plied him with His deep questions, how could he answer even one of a thousand ? God is so great and terrible that, however innocent he might be, he must yet bow prostrate before Him, and plead guilty. God, he feels, is determined to have him in the wrong.

Though I wash myself in snow water,  
 And make my hands never so clean,  
 Yet wilt thou plunge me in the ditch,  
 So that my very clothes shall abhor me. (ix. 30 f.)

Yet Job knows he is innocent of all great transgression. And

<sup>1</sup> עֲיָי is one of the 18 *Tiqqune Sopherim* (emendations of the Scribes).  
 עֲיָיִךְ is doubtless the original reading.

in one outburst of desperate defiance he arraigns his Almighty Antagonist. He has no regard for his life: he spurns it as a hateful thing. Let God therefore slay him, if He please: he will speak out his mind. "I am innocent; but it is all one: God destroyeth the innocent and the wicked alike." There is no justice in His rule. Injustice prevails throughout the world. When plague comes, the innocent are slain equally with the wicked; and God mocks at their despair. "The earth is given over to the power of the wicked; and God blindeth the eyes of its judges," so that they can no longer distinguish right and wrong. And God cannot deny the charge. "If it be not He, who then is it?" (ix. 21 ff.)

This may be the most convenient point to define the issues involved in the conflict between Job and his friends. It would be grossly unjust to characterize Job's friends as naturally unkind or intolerant. They were, according to their lights, good, wise, true-hearted and deeply religious men. Typical representatives of the current orthodoxy, they believed with all their hearts in God and His righteous reign. He was the supreme Ruler and Author of all that happened; and what He did must be right. The key to the Divine government was thus found in the simple and straightforward principle: God visits righteousness with happiness and good fortune, and wickedness with misfortune and misery. To men imbued with this idea, their friend's calamities had but one explanation: a good man at heart, he had yet fallen into some grievous sin, for which God was now exacting the due penalty. But it was sympathetic sorrow rather than anger that moved them at the first. They loved their friend, and grieved deeply over his misfortunes; and they honestly sought to help him with their counsel. If only he would acknowledge his sin and turn to God, they were persuaded that He would readily



pardon and heal him, and make his future happier even than his past. Thus, one after the other, they sought, with true tenderness of touch, avoiding all that would hurt his feelings, and dwelling rather on the unsearchable holiness of God, in Whose sight even the angels of heaven are unclean, to bring home his sins to his conscience. And they all draw lovely pictures of the happiness that will follow his turning to God.

He will yet fill thy mouth with laughter,  
 And thy lips with shouting. (viii. 21.)  
 Thou shalt forget thy misery,  
 Thou shalt remember it as waters that are passed away.  
 And thy life shall be clearer than the noonday;  
 Though there be darkness, it shall shine as morning light.  
 (xi. 16 f.)

But Job's impious blasphemy (as they can only count it) leads them to plainer dealing. It is now clear that he has committed some great iniquity, which he wraps up in his heart. And, moreover, such talk as his would undermine the foundations of all religion. (xv. 4.) They no longer scruple, therefore, to charge him directly with sin. The grave and courteous Eliphaz, the worthiest of the three, even draws up a whole catalogue of crimes of which he holds his friend guilty. (xxii. 5 ff.) Nor do they spare his feelings. They hold up his children's fate as a signal example of the bitter fruits of wickedness. (viii. 4.) And they warn him of still more terrible calamities to come. As yet, God has exacted of him less than his iniquity deserveth. (xi. 6.) If he repent not, He will pour out all His wrath, overwhelming him in calamities. (xviii. 4 ff.)

Job starts from the same general principles as his friends. For him, too, God is the great First Cause, and the supreme Dispenser of good and evil fortune. And God distributes good and evil according as He judges men righteous or wicked. But God has brought all this evil upon him,

though he is innocent. Therefore, he can only conclude, God's government is unjust. (ix. 21 ff.) This idea once rooted in his mind, he looks out on the universe, and finds it one vast realm of miserable injustice. The climax is reached in the deliberate impeachment of Providence in chapter xxi., where the misfortunes of the righteous are contrasted with the happiness of the wicked who have no fear of God, but yet "spend their days in prosperity, and in peace go down to Sheol," and find the very clods sweet unto them. If it be answered that God visits the iniquities of the wicked upon their children, is that not further proof of His injustice? (xxi. 19.) And if appeal be made to His greatness, is not His injustice all the more monstrous? There seems no limit to Job's reckless defiance of the Almighty. God is not only unjust, but He is devoid of all dignity and honourable feeling. He has not the generosity to forgive his sins, and forget them. (vii. 21.) But, like a petty inquisitor, He spies on his minutest actions, and delights only to search out his faults. (x. 3 ff.) He even rakes up the ashes of the long dead past, and brings up the sins of his thoughtless youth against him. (xiii. 26.) In his wild frenzy, Job imputes to God the most exquisite refinement of cruelty; for as he broods over his past blessedness, the terrible thought occurs to him that God fashioned him, and crowned him with favour, and made his past life so happy—only to hurl him into these calamities, and so aggravate his pain. (x. 8 ff.)

To which of these conflicting voices then are we to listen?

In his learned and acute studies of Job, Budde has revived the theory of Hengstenberg, that the truth lies on the side of the friends, and is found in its purest form in the speeches of Elihu, for whose authenticity he vigorously contends. In his former days, Budde concedes, Job was a "perfect and upright" man. But there were germs of spiritual pride and self-righteousness latent in his character; and

God designed his sufferings to purge him of this evil leaven. The actual result of his afflictions at first was to drive him into blasphemous attacks on the Almighty. But his friends revealed to him the true meaning of the visitation. Then, when his heart was softened, God Himself appeared to drive home the truth. And Job withdrew his blasphemies, and repented in dust and ashes. It may be enough to reply to this construction that Job is the real hero of the piece, and that our sympathies are all with him. His friends may pour out their truisms—for their general observations are true enough; Job may shock us by his profanities; yet it is he that holds our interest,—all the more as he leaves his friends behind, and girds himself for his Titanic contest with the Almighty. And we cannot doubt that the poet meant it so. The friends and their rigid maxims are but the foil. It is in the struggles and doubts of Job that the poet tells the story of his own soul.

Are we then to regard the tendency of the poem as negative and destructive? Such is the view of a number of scholars, represented in this country by Dr. E. J. Dillon, who classes Job among his *Sceptics of the Old Testament*; and in Germany by Fried. Delitzsch, who calls the poem the “Song of Songs (*Hohelied*) of Pessimism.” The most extreme advocate of this theory is Eugen Müller, pastor in Rostock, who in a recent monograph, *Der echte Hiob* (1902), describes the poem as practically atheistic, involving a complete denial of Divine righteousness. But this view fails to recognize the complexity of human character, which poetry, as distinguished from logic, reflects. No one is perfectly consistent in his thoughts and feelings. Especially at times of darkness and doubt, the mind oscillates, often from one extreme to the other. The poet has depicted Job in such a state. He has lost his old moorings, and plunges hither and thither on a sea of troubles. Now he sinks to the trough of the wave.

But again he rises on its crest to heights of faith unknown to the unruffled orthodoxy of his friends. And the movement of his soul is no vain tumult of the waves. The current sets steadily forward to faith and God. And in this lies the real interest of the poem.

In his noble Commentary on Job, Ewald has a pregnant remark: "When doubt has been fully developed, it soon proves its own destruction; and thus the higher truth is brought to light." The poem affords a fine example; for Job's renewing faith is almost the direct recoil from his doubts.

We have seen how loyalty to conscience has made him impugn the justice of God. But all the while he clings to the just God, and grounds his hope on Him alone. Thus, when the friends try to justify God's ways by their "maxims of ashes," he accuses them of "respecting God's person," pleading His cause by lying servility. And he warns them that, if they pursue this course, God will break out upon them in His dreadful excellency. For He is a God that respecteth truth and straightforwardness alone. (xiii. 7 ff.) If so, then God must recognize the justice of his cause. His friends continue to treat him as a wicked man. But God knows he is innocent. "Even now, behold, my Witness is in heaven; and he that voucheth for me is on high." (xvi. 19.) Meantime, indeed, his Witness is silent. But one day He must appear to speak on his behalf, and so to vindicate his righteousness. And on that day, once more the sufferer warns his friends, the Almighty will inflict punishment on them for their injustice; and they will know there is a righteous Judge. (xix. 29.)

In the same way he returns to the blissful thought of the mercy of God. In his misery, he had looked to his friends for pity; but they had failed him like the brooks that come down full in springtime when the ice and snow melt, but dry

up in the drought of summer, when men most need their waters. (vi. 15 ff.) They showed themselves even as pitiless as his Almighty Persecutor. (xix. 22.) And his only hope now lay in His mercy. In the frenzy of his pain he had pictured God as a very monster of cruelty, who had shown him favour at the first, only to add to his grief. But in his craving for a friend to pity him, he turns to God with a new longing. He feels that the God with whom he once walked so lovingly cannot abandon him to never-ending misery. His present wrath will pass away, and He will again have mercy upon His friend, before He lays him in the dust where He shall find him no more. Or even if He leave him to perish in his misery, He will in after days remember him, and repent, and come down to do him justice. (vii. 21.)

This new faith in God's merciful justice bears him up on one of the loftiest flights of spirit in the Old Testament. We have seen how wistfully, in his first sense of desolation, he longed for death as his only release from misery. Again and again he returns, fascinated, to the thought.

Oh that I might have my request,  
And that God would grant me the thing that I long for !  
Even that it would please God to crush me,  
That He would let loose His hand and cut me off !  
Then should I yet have comfort,  
Yea, I would exult in ruthless pain. (vi. 8 ff.)

But as he gazes into the misty depths of Sheol, the horror of death seizes him. The land of the dead is "a land of thick darkness, without any order, where the light is as darkness" (x. 22); and out of it there is no return.

As the cloud is consumed and vanisheth away,  
So he that goeth down to Sheol shall come up no more.  
He shall not return again to his house,  
And his place shall know him no more. (vii. 9 f.)

And therefore in Sheol Job can no longer hope to see the



vindication of his cause, but must go down to posterity as a godless man. The thought is intolerable, and he revolts against it. The first gleam of a hope beyond breaks from almost midnight gloom. (Chap. xiv.) Job is mourning over man's brief and troublous life and swift, untimely end. "There is hope of the tree, if it be cut down, that it will sprout again." It may be cut down to the stump, and its root all decayed, "yet at the scent of water it will bud, and put forth boughs like a fresh, young plant."

But man dieth, and is laid low :  
 Yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he ?  
 As the waters fail from the sea,  
 And the river decayeth and drieth up,  
 So man lieth down and riseth not ;  
 Till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake,  
 Nor be roused out of their sleep. (*vv.* 11 f.)

But the hope of the tree suggests to the despairing soul a possible hope for man as well. "Perhaps he too will die and rise again."<sup>1</sup> Perhaps God will bring him down to Sheol, to hide him there till His wrath be past, and then "appoint him a set time and remember him." If he could entertain this hope, then he should wait patiently, and endure the cruellest pains, all the days of his warfare, till his release came ; and then, when God called, he would joyfully answer, and forget the misery of the past in the bliss of his new life with God. (*vv.* 13 f.) It is a hope, however, too high for him to grasp ; and he is plunged into deeper darkness than before. Death is the extinguisher of all man's hope

The waters wear the stones ;  
 Their outpourings wash away the dust of the earth :  
 So thou destroyest the hope of man.

<sup>1</sup> Surely not "a momentary interruption of doubt" (Davidson), but the theoretical principle of the hope in *v.* 15. If only he could be sure that man died and rose again, then he would bear all things bravely, expecting the time of his release.

Thou prevailest for ever against him, and he passeth ;  
Thou changest his countenance, and banishest him from thy  
presence. (*vv.* 19 f.)

And the lot of the dead man in Sheol is utterly miserable. He knows nothing more of what takes place in the upper world. He cannot follow the fortunes even of his dearest. "His sons come to honour, but he knoweth it not ; and they are brought low, but he perceiveth it not." Nor is the sleep of the dead unbroken rest. He sleeps—"perchance to dream"! Though he knows nothing of his friends on earth, yet "his own flesh hath pain, and his own soul mourneth" (*vv.* 21 f.).

But again Job rises on the wings of faith and hope. The main part of the 19th chapter is perhaps the most pitiful passage in the book. Bildad has just drawn his terrible picture of the wicked man's fate. And Job, stung to the heart, seeks to move his friends to pity by the spectacle of all his accumulated woes : his glory stripped away, his hope plucked up by the root, God his Adversary, his dearest friends estranged from him, and no one to hear his cries and bring him redress for his wrongs, for God hath "subverted him in his cause." (*vv.* 6 ff.) But his friends are cold and pitiless as God Himself. (*v.* 22.) In his despair Job turns for his vindication to posterity. If only he could write his defence in a book, or engrave it on the rock with an iron stylus and molten lead, then future generations would read it, and judge justly, and attest his righteousness. (*vv.* 23 f.) But the record on the rocks is impossible. And again he turns to God. "But I know that my Vindicator—my Goel—liveth, and that He will one day stand upon my dust, as Afterman, to see justice done to my name ; and though then my flesh be consumed away, yet in spirit I shall rise to see the triumph of my cause ; and mine eyes shall behold God, no more a stranger to me."

(vv. 25 ff.)<sup>1</sup> It is not indeed the hope of a blessed immortality that here floats before Job's vision. But he does hope to rise from Sheol, and see God in person, if it be but for a moment, on the day when He stands upon his dust to vindicate his cause. Here Job reaches "the culminating point of his hope in God" (Godet). But he does not dwell long on the height which he has thus gained. The dazzling vision makes him reel. "His reins are consumed within him." (v. 27.) And he swiftly returns to earth, and his speeches henceforth move on lower planes.

Commentators on *Job* have been much perplexed by this apparent descent. It is not enough to say that the poet's hope of immortality was not sure enough to rest upon. By all the rules of art, the *positive* movement of the drama must be found in these succeeding chapters. And had immortality been the real solution of the problem (as Ewald, for example, maintains), the poet would have followed the gleam to fuller light. We must seek, therefore, for some other motive. Duhm and Smend, who have attacked this part of the problem most decisively, hold that Job has now found peace for himself, and turns to wrestle with the mysteries of the larger world. It is true that his most sustained impeachment of Providence is found in these later chapters (chap. xxi.). But the personal element is still predominant. And Job's speeches culminate in the great *Apologia pro Vitâ Suâ* (chap. xxix.-xxx.). The true explanation of the difficulty, we feel, lies nearer at hand. The problem of Job was far more practical than speculative. He had lost his old faith because it failed to

<sup>1</sup> These verses present many difficulties in detail, and the best translation can only be approximate. But from the context three things seem perfectly clear: (1) Job expects no other end of his miseries than speedy death; (2) he looks to God to be his Goel, the champion of his cause *after death*; and (3) he cherishes the hope that he will rise from Sheol to see the vindication of his rights.

stand the test of new experience. But he still felt that fellowship with God was the chief blessing of life ; and he was steadily fighting his way back through darkness and doubt to a more personal knowledge of God. It was this he sought far more than answers to his baffling questions. Obviously, the solution of this problem could not be postponed to the life beyond, were his hope of immortality never so sure. He must reach God in this present life. And the interest of the last section of the poem lies in his actual finding of God, and restoration to His friendship.

Again, Job returns to God by the very path that had formerly seemed to lead him away from God. As we have seen, his difficulty was not about the existence of God, or His justice in the abstract. It was that he could not find justice in God. If they went to court together, there was no daysman to secure him fair play ; and God was so great and terrible that he must needs bow prostrate before Him and acknowledge himself guilty. (ix. 3 ff.) But the very ground of his despair became his hope. If he could but win his way to God's presence, that fact alone would prove his salvation ; for no godless man could come before Him. (xiii. 16.) And if he once succeeded in setting his case fairly before God, the Almighty Judge must justify him : for he is innocent. In spite of God's terrors, therefore, Job is determined to appear and plead his case before Him. God may slay him for his presumption : nevertheless, he will take his life in his hand, and will maintain his ways before Him. Two conditions only he lays down : that God will remove His terrors, so that he may state his case calmly, and that He will be frank with him, and tell him plainly where he has sinned. (xiii. 13 ff.) The great victory he has gained over Sheol in chapter xix. gives him new courage to press his suit. He feels sure that his heavenly Vindicator will no longer disdain to hear him, but will listen attentively

to his plea (xxiii. 6.) In a strange antinomy of thought, he looks to God his Vindicator to be his Daysman with the God who sits upon the throne. And as He knows all his way of life, he is fully persuaded that, whatever test the great Judge may apply to him, "when He hath tried me, I shall come forth as gold." (xxiii. 10.) The full statement of his case is finally made in the great chapters to which we have already referred: chapter xxix., in which he draws that most glorious picture of a good man happy and honoured; chapter xxx., in which he depicts the intolerable miseries of his present state; and chapter xxxi.—a passage that touches the high-water mark of Old Testament morality—in which he sets forth his claim of righteousness. He has done nothing, he asserts, to merit these calamities. He has not only kept his hands clean from gross sins, but he has never even admitted the thought of such things into his heart. He has never allowed himself to be seduced into idolatry, or made gold his confidence. No cruelty, or inhumanity, can be laid to his charge. He has been the stedfast friend of the poor, the friendless and the stranger, for whom his door and hand were ever open. He has never even rejoiced at the troubles that befell his enemies, but treated all men alike as brethren whom the One God fashioned in the womb. This, he triumphantly declares, is his case, duly drawn. And here he affixes his sign-manual. Let his Almighty Antagonist now present His indictment. Let Him bring together the full catalogue of his transgressions. And Job will carry it upon his shoulder, and bind it on his forehead as a crown—so radiantly conscious is he of his innocence. And in this sublime confidence he will draw near as a prince to the Divine presence. (xxx. 35 ff.)<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The speech of Job ought really to end with the princely approach to God's presence. Verses 38–40 have been accidentally transposed from their original position (perhaps after vv. 33 f.). If, as we hold (in spite



In all this movement of soul we cannot see the working out of any definite theory of suffering, but rather the reflection of a real spiritual experience. The poem is the dramatic representation of the poet's own sufferings and doubts, his bitter feelings and blasphemous thoughts of the strange providence of God, his wrestlings with the barren consolations of well-meaning friends which only drove him into deeper despair, but also the proud consciousness of his own rectitude which he maintained through all his fears and doubts, and the steps by which he climbed again the steep ascent of heaven.

The poet has thus led us close to the one great and inevitable *dénouement*. Job has presented his case, and challenged God to arraign him. God must now appear, either to explain the mystery, or at least to vindicate His own character. And at the dramatic moment He does appear, in a burst of glorious music, to answer Job out of the whirlwind. In His speech,<sup>1</sup> therefore, we may look for the highest wisdom and truth the poet has to teach us—the revelation of God in which he himself found salvation.

In these chapters we have perhaps the most sublime poetry in literature. In vision after vision of exquisite beauty and perfect poetic truth, we have the whole panorama of creation unrolled before us: the heavens and the earth and the place of the dead, the home of light and darkness, the treasures of the snow and hail, the path of the lightning, the mists and floods that refresh even the desert places and the lands where no man is, the constellations and their

of Budde's subtle defence), the Elihu speeches are a later addition, the Divine appearance follows immediately after Job's declaration of his innocence. This adds greatly to the dramatic power of the poem.

<sup>1</sup> We follow most recent editors in reading *one* speech of Jahveh (chap xxxviii., xxxix., xl. 2, 8-14) and *one* prostrate reply from Job (xl. 3-5, xlii. 2-6). The pictures of behemoth and leviathan (xl. 15-xli. *fin.*) are universally regarded as a later addition.

ordered march, and the animal creation in their native freedom. And in stupendous irony Job is invited to ascend the throne, and himself assume the government of the universe.

Like the poor mortal who here dares to contend with the Almighty, we are overwhelmed by the splendour of it all. But when the first dazzling impression is over, we cannot but ask : Is not God blinding His servant by His glorious light, only to leave him in blacker darkness than before ?

Our instinctive disappointment with the sublime *dénouement* arises, it seems to us, from our applying our colder Western minds to the poem. It is the speculative aspect of the problem that most appeals to us, and we approach the poem expecting to find some clear logical solution contained in it. But, as we have already emphasized, the poet himself was hardly concerned with this aspect. It was a profoundly practical problem that faced him. He had lost his faith, and was painfully fighting his way back to faith. From this point of view, the mere fact of God's appearance is of supreme importance. Faith involves a twofold relation. In Newman's great words, religion is a relation "between two, and two only, absolutely luminous and self-evident beings, myself and my Creator." To the poet, as he stands revealed in his hero, his own character was perfectly luminous. He was sure of himself, and of his own innocence and sincerity. But God was shrouded in darkness. To the very end of his struggles Job is oppressed by the elusiveness of God. He feels Him to be all about him. He is assured that He will vindicate his rights. Yet he cannot grasp Him.

Behold, I go forward, but He is not there;  
And backward, but I cannot perceive Him;  
I seek Him <sup>1</sup> on the left hand, but I cannot behold Him :  
I turn <sup>2</sup> to the right hand, but I cannot see Him. (xxiii. 8 f.)

<sup>1</sup> and <sup>2</sup> We follow Duhm in reading *בְּיָמֵי* for *בְּעֵשְׂתוֹ* and *וְאֶחָד* for *וְאֶחָד*.

For the restoration of living religion he needed a new experience of God. And the Divine appearance reflects this experience. Stripped of its poetic dress, it is no other than a real vision of God in the works of His hand. The poet who thus unveils his experience had hitherto sought to regain God in the feelings and cravings and strivings of his own heart. But there he found, at the best, only his own aspirations after, and ideas about, God—not the living God Himself. Now he rises out of himself and his own self-centred broodings and questionings to contemplate the great universe around him ; and there he finds all things instinct with God. And God becomes to him as luminous a Being as his own soul. In the same way—if we may compare modern philosophy with ancient poetry, for the heart of man is the same in all the ages—Kant, lost in speculative mazes, found salvation in the immediate intuition of God in “ the starry heavens above and the moral law within.”

And further, if we study the speech of Jahveh from the Oriental point of view, we do find it luminous with the light the doubter sought for. The Oriental does not prove and argue, but is most sensitive to direct mental presentations. He feels by immediate instinct what we can only painfully educe. The speech of Jahveh is characteristically Oriental. It offers no speculative answer to the problem of suffering. But it gives majestic impressions of the greatness, the power and wisdom, and the gracious care of God, Who has created all things so well, and rules them so wisely, and provides so bountifully even for the wild creatures of the desert, who live so far apart from human life. And though the inference is not directly drawn, the moral is clear. In the universe of human life, as well as in the boundless universe without, there is much complexity and much mystery, many things that are far beyond our power to comprehend. But the God of wisdom, power and grace rules in both

worlds. And though we cannot trace even the outlines of His purpose, we can yet trust Him to rule our lives wisely, lovingly and well. We have the same appeal to immediate intuition, and the same moral, in the Sermon on the Mount. "Behold the fowls of the air ; for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns : yet your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are ye not much better than they ? . . . Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow ; they toil not, neither do they spin : and yet I say unto you that even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of them. Wherefore, shall God not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith ? " (Matt. vi. 26 ff.).

In Job's answer to the Almighty we have the effect the poet intended to produce by the speech ; and this bears out our reading of the poem. The effect is purely practical. Job understands the mysteries of Providence no better than before ; but he has reached a new personal experience of God. Hitherto he had known Him only by tradition, " by the hearing of the ear." Now he knows Him in actual spiritual experience. " Mine own eye seeth Thee." This vision of God at first overwhelms him—as every real vision of God's transcendent glory must—and he retracts his former blasphemous cavillings against Almighty Providence. He will no longer dare to criticize the ways of God ; for they are too high and wonderful for him. " I know that Thou canst do all things, and that no purpose of Thine can be restrained." Yet he knows God as *his* God, and can now rest assured that He will do all things well. Henceforth, then, he will live more humbly and reverently, yet with all the more glad confidence, before his God, doing justice and loving mercy, whatever outward fortune may betide. (xlii. 2 ff.)

The revelation of God in which Job found peace is, indeed, imperfect. It is not only that Nature, from another point

of view, is "red in tooth and claw with ravine"; but the restless heart of man craves for a deeper—a more human and personal—knowledge of God. Only in the Son who was "the effulgence of His glory and the very image of His substance," Who loved us and gave Himself for us, do we find perfect rest for our souls. And yet the light in which Job rejoiced was a real revelation from God—a bright ray of the light that was to shine "more and more unto the perfect day." He knew not the meaning of his sufferings. But through them he entered into closer fellowship with his God. And though he had no sure hope of immortal life, yet (to use his own image) he had "graven his testimony on the rock," and suffering saints in future days read it, and embraced the hope that God was "nevertheless with them all their days, and would afterwards receive them into glory." (Ps. lxiii. 23 f.) And thus the poet was a witness beforehand to Him who "brought life and immortality to light," through faith in Whom we know that "the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in us."

ALEX. R. GORDON.



### IRENÆUS ON THE APOSTOLICAL PREACHING.

WE have now before us the text of the newly-found treatise of Irenæus *On the Apostolical Preaching*, which forms the first part of the thirty-first volume of Harnack's *Texte und Untersuchungen*. More exactly we should have put, instead of Harnack, the joint names of Harnack and Schmidt, and that collocation would have at once reminded us that another of the great patristic lights has gone out, and that the long-continued co-operation of von Gebhardt and Harnack has been ended in the way in which the best-established of partnerships must be broken up at the last. The record of von Gebhardt's literary work remains, and it will not be easy, even for a well-trained and capable scholar, to succeed him.

But here is Irenæus, fresh from the press, and full of interest and surprises. To begin with, a discovery of second-century literature can never be anything but interesting, in view of the fact that it was in this century that the organization and doctrine of the Church were really established, and the interest is unusual in the case of a writer like Irenæus, who claims to be in touch with the Apostolical tradition through Papias and Polycarp and the elders who had known the Apostle John. As is well known, we have the already extant works of Irenæus only through translation or by quotation; his great work, the five books against Heresies, is only known from the Latin translation, with the supplement of a few Greek, Syriac, and Armenian quotations; the original Greek is supposed by Zahn to have been extant in the sixteenth century; and, although doubt has been cast on his argument, we are not without hope that a complete copy of the original Greek may yet be lurking somewhere. But beside the five books against

Heresies, there are traces of a number of other writings which have either wholly, or in great part, perished. Fragments are extant of certain letters to Florinus, in which he warns him against the erroneous nature of the beliefs which he was embracing, and holds Polycarp up to him *in terrorem*. He wrote also certain other tracts relating to controversial matters of the time, such as the date of the Easter festival ; and we learn from Eusebius that he dedicated a treatise to one Marcianus *On the Apostolical Preaching*, and it is this treatise which has suddenly come to light from as unexpected a quarter as could have been conceived, the library of the Armenian Church at Erivan, in Russian Armenia, where it was unearthed in 1904 by one of the most able of the younger Armenian ecclesiastics, Karabet ter-Mekertschian. He has now edited the text in collaboration with his friend, ter-Minassiantz, accompanied by a German translation of such fidelity and excellence that it needed very little emendation at the hand of Harnack and his editorial office. I was in Erivan in 1903, and had the pleasure of visiting these learned Armenians at the great convent of Etschmiadzin ; little suspecting, as we examined the treasures of their great library, that a patristic document of the first magnitude was lying only a few miles away and waiting to be discovered. We may at least take heart in two directions : first, in the belief that it is still reasonable to expect the recovery of the lost documents of the early Church ; and second, that the Armenian people have given us one more proof that they are not the dying race which they are, in many quarters, assumed to be ; but that in the region of religion, as well as in that of science, they are, as I have often maintained publicly, the brain of Asia.

The first reading of the new book will, I think, cause something of a sense of disappointment ; it appears to be wanting in originality. This is partly due to the fact that

it is a catechetical treatise, following the conventional lines of the teaching of the Church of the second century, and using the same arguments and proof-texts as are found elsewhere in that period and the time immediately subsequent. The Gospels are *not* the foundation of the argument, the whole weight of which is thrown upon the Old Testament, that is to say, upon the prophecies, together with the allegorical and mystical explanation of the histories. At first sight this is both surprising and disappointing, for Irenaeus is instructing his friend Marcianus in the very foundations of the Faith, and he hardly uses the Gospel at all; everything is prophecy and gnosis, just as it is with Justin Martyr; and the Gospels, which Irenaeus speaks of elsewhere, in a well-known passage, as comparable to the four pillars of the world and the four winds of heaven, take relatively less place than they do in Justin Martyr. The fault is in the method of teaching, which Irenaeus has clearly inherited. His real gospel is the Book of Testimonies, concerning which we wrote something in this magazine last November. We will return to this point presently. But the fault, as it seems to us, is the more patent when we remember that the book before us is probably one of the last things that Irenaeus ever wrote. He refers to his great work on Heresies, which can hardly have been completed much before 190 A.D., so that the new tract must belong to the last decade of the second century. One would have supposed that, by this date, the Gospels would have taken their right place in the education of a catechumen, and that the person of Christ would have been presented historically, and not by the method of obscure and often impossible reflections from the Prophets or the Psalms.

So far is Irenaeus from using the historical foundations of Christianity, that he does not even know how old Christ

was when He died, nor what emperor He died under. There is a well-known passage in the *Adv. Haereses*, ii. 22, which has caused grave searchings of heart, because it implied a belief (based, perhaps, in the first instance, on a misunderstood passage of St. John's Gospel) that our Lord must have been nearly fifty years of age, in opposition to the common belief that He was little more than thirty years when He finished His public ministry. And here, in the Apostolical Preaching, we are quietly informed that He suffered under Pontius Pilate (so far we are following the Apostolical Symbol), but that Pontius Pilate was the procurator *under the emperor Claudius*. It will be very difficult, in view of the known procuratorship of Pontius Pilate under Tiberius, and his subsequent recall, to trust Irenaeus in any matter that requires the exercise of the historical sense; for if chronology is one of the eyes of history, he has deliberately put that eye out. We must not look to the new tract (nor to the old author) for historical details. Its value, and his, lie in another direction.

The argument of the book is as follows. One attains truth through purity of soul and body: through right thinking and right acting, through right belief and right love. Right belief consists in knowing the things that really are (*τὰ ὄντα*): it is a doctrine of God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. The Holy Ghost brings us to the knowledge of the Son, the Son to the knowledge of the Father. The world was created by the Word of God, and was made for a habitation of men, to whom is given lordship over the angels. Irenaeus then proceeds to summarize the whole of the history of the world, from the Creation, Fall, Flood, Call of Abraham, and so on, down to the building of the Temple and the rise of the Prophets. (In writing the history of the flood, he borrows freely from the Book of Enoch.) The Prophets declare the Incarnation of Christ and



the redemption of men. The Virgin Birth is proved by the prophecies and by an Old-Testament gnosis which makes Mary the second Eve. A few lines are given to the preaching of John the Baptist and to the works and sufferings of Christ recorded in the Gospels. After which the writer returns to the Old Testament and the theology supposed to be latent in it, with regard to the Deity and Pre-existence of Christ. A casual reference is made to John the disciple of the Lord and the opening sentence of his Gospel. The order and method of the Book of Testimonies are closely followed, and after establishing all the main points of the Gospel account from the Old Testament, he concludes that "*these testimonies* show his Davidic descent, according to the flesh, and His birth in the city of David"; we are not to look for His birth among the heathen *or anywhere else but in Bethlehem*. His works and sufferings were also foretold. It is surprising that the teaching of Christ is almost entirely absent; His sayings are not quoted, and, more disappointing still, there are no apocryphal sayings or new words of Jesus. The writer concludes with a little warning against the heresies of the time, which are classified as heresies concerning the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. We must not divide the Father from the Creator, we must not depreciate or deny the Incarnation, and we must not undervalue the gifts of the Holy Spirit, especially the prophetic gift, for it is through these gifts that life becomes fruitful.

Such being the structure of the book, we repeat that the first reading is somewhat disappointing, even when we agree with Harnack that there are directions in which it makes a great impression upon us: as, for example, in the complete absence of hierarchical and ceremonial elements, and in the relatively small position given to the Sacraments. Church authority and tradition are not appealed to; they



are latent, but not directly affirmed. The sum of the doctrine of Irenæus is that a life of faith in God is a life of love to man. We wish he had divided his subject a little more evenly, and given more place to the human relations of the Christian man. In this respect he does not come near to the ethical elevation of Aristides, for example. But now, having done with preliminary disappointments, let us turn to the text and see what light we can throw on some of the passages.

In the first place, we have the important evidence of a quotation from Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians. Up to the present we had no early quotation from Polycarp, and the external evidence for his Epistle was limited (as far as the first two centuries after its composition are concerned) to a statement of Irenæus (*Haer.* iii. 3, 4), in which he declares that—

“There is a very adequate letter of Polycarp written to the Philippians, from which those who desire it, and who care for their own salvation, can learn both the character of his faith and the message of the truth.”

Now let us turn to the *Apostolical Preaching*, c. 95 :—

“Through faith in the Son of God, we learn to love God with all our heart and our neighbour as ourselves. But *love to God is far from all sins*, and love to the neighbour causes no evil to the neighbour.”

Compare with this the following from Polycarp, *ad Phil.* 3 :—

“Faith is the mother of us all, followed by hope, in front of whom goes love to God and to Christ and to the neighbour. For if one be within these, he has fulfilled the law of righteousness; *for he that hath love is far from all sin.*”

The coincidence in words is reinforced by the coincidence of the whole argument, and there cannot be any doubt

that Irenaeus is using Polycarp, with whose writings he shows himself in another passage to be acquainted. It is curious that Harnack does not seem to have noticed the quotation, any more than the Armenian editors; but it is of some importance critically.

Another interesting case of an unidentified quotation will be found in c. 77. Here we are told, amongst the prophecies of the Passion, to reckon the following:—

“It is said in the book of the Twelve Prophets: they chained him and brought him there to the king as a present. For Pontius Pilate was the procurator of Judaea, and was at that time at enmity with Herod, the king of the Jews. But after, when Christ was brought to him in chains, Pilate sent Him to Herod, leaving him to examine Him, in order to know exactly what he would do with Him, using Christ as an excuse for reconciliation with the king.”

Here the editors are at fault, and Harnack adds that to the best of his knowledge there is no such passage in the Minor Prophets, and that it is significant that Irenaeus, in this instance, does not give the name of the prophet whom he is quoting.

The passage is Hosea x. 6, which the LXX present in the following form:—

καὶ αὐτὸν εἰς Ἀσσυρίους δέσαντες, ἀπήνεγκαν ξένια τῷ βασιλεῖ Ἰαρείμ.

It is not easy to see how this Greek was made out of the Hebrew, as we know it; and it is well known that the passages relating to King Jarib are to this day a *crux interpretum*. But that the passage was taken as a prophetic testimony to Christ and His trial, is certain. Suppose we turn to Justin, *Dialogue with Trypho*, c. 103; here we find as follows:—

Ἡρώδου δὲ, τὸν Ἀρχέλαον διαδεξαμένον, λαβόντος τὴν ἐξουσίαν τὴν ἀπονεμηθεῖσαν αὐτῷ, ᾧ καὶ Πιλάτος χαριζόμενος δεδεμένον τὸν Ἰησοῦν

ἔπεμψε, καὶ τοῦτο γενησόμενον προειδὼς ὁ θεὸς εἰρήκει οὕτως· καί γε αὐτὸν εἰς Ἀσσυρίους ἀπήνεγκαν ξένια τῷ βασιλεῖ.

Here Justin makes the same connexion as Irenæus between the passage in Hosea and the account of what passed between Pilate and Herod.

The same connexion is made in Tertullian against Marcion (iv. 42):—

“Nam et Herodi velut munus a Pilato missus, Osee vocibus fidem reddidit: de Christo enim prophetaverat: et vinctum eum ducent xeniam regi.”

Tertullian, as is well known, used the prophetic testimonies in slaying Marcion; and I think it is quite likely that both he and Justin are using a formal collection of such testimonies; for the connexion between Hosea and the Gospel is by no means obvious, even to a person whose mind was set on finding Christ in the Old Testament. In any case, there can be no doubt where Irenæus' quotation comes from. We shall find the same connexion made in Cyril of Jerusalem (*Cat.* xiii. 14) as follows: δεθεῖς ἦλθεν ἀπὸ τοῦ Καϊάφα πρὸς Πιλάτον· ἄρα καὶ τοῦτο γέγραπται· καὶ δῆσαντες αὐτὸν ἀπήνεγκαν ξένια τῷ βασιλεῖ Ἰαρείμ. And also in Ruffinus on the Symbol.

And this brings us to the interesting question of the relation of the composition, and of the catechetical teaching which underlies it, to the collection of prophetic passages which I have shown to be current in the early Church, whose original title seems to have been *Testimonies against the Jews*. Does the new treatise involve Irenæus in the use of that early book in the way that I have suggested in the too brief article which I wrote on the subject in the *EXPOSITOR* for last November? For example, we are to ask whether it quotes the same proof-texts as the Book of Testimonies, whether it quotes them with similar sequences, with the same misunderstandings, like combinations, similar

displacements of the names of authors quoted, and so on.

Perhaps it will be sufficient if I present a few striking cases of coincidence in the matter quoted from the Old Testament and in the manner in which it is quoted.

It will be remembered that I drew attention to the way in which Bar Şalibi, in his *Testimonies against the Jews*, quotes as follows :—

“David said : Before the day-star I begat thee. And before the sun is his name and before the moon. Now explain to us, when was Israel born before the day-star, etc.”

The combination of passages from the 110th Psalm and the 71st Psalm was noted, and it was shown that the same two passages were combined in Justin, *Dialogue*, 76, and in the collection of prophetic extracts ascribed to Gregory of Nyssa.

Now turn to the new treatise, c. 43, and you will find Irenaeus establishing the pre-existence of Christ from the first verse of the book of Genesis, after which he goes on :—

“And Jeremiah the prophet also testifies this as follows : Before the morning-star have I begotten thee, and before the sun is his name.”

Here the very same sequence occurs, in exact agreement with Bar Şalibi ; and we have, over and above that coincidence, an error of ascription such as frequently occurs in these collections, by which Jeremiah is made responsible for the Psalms ! Probably, though I have not been able to verify this, a proof-text from Jeremiah lay adjacent. A similar case exists in our Gospel of Matthew with reference to the potter’s field, and the parallel is particularly interesting because Irenaeus quotes it in the newly-found treatise, and evidently *not* from the Gospel. His language is as follows :—

c. 81, "And again Jeremiah the prophet said: 'And they took the thirty pieces of silver, the price of the one that was sold, whom they of the children of Israel had bought, and gave them for the potter's field, as the Lord commanded me.' For Judas, who was of Christ's disciples," etc.

A comparison of the other passages which are similarly treated will show that Irenæus means to quote the prophet, and does not mean to quote the Gospel. From which again we infer that the famous reading stood in a book of Testimonies.

Another famous passage to which I referred was the prophecy of Jacob concerning Judah ("the sceptre shall not fail from Judah," etc), which I showed to have been current in the book of Testimonies as a prophecy of Moses (see Iren., *adv. Haer.* iv. 10, and Justin, 1 *Ap.* 32). In c. 57 of the new treatise we get the same matter brought forward, with the preface, "And Moses says in Genesis," the change in the manner of introducing the passage being made so as to avoid the error of the ascription of the prophecy to Moses. Then, after explaining the meaning of the blessing of Judah, and how he washes his garments in wine, which is a symbol of eternal joy, he goes on, "And on this account he is also the hope of the heathen, *who hope in him.*" This addition becomes clearer if we assume that somewhere in the neighbourhood of the words he was quoting (*αὐτὸς προσδοκία ἐθνῶν*) there stood the words:

*καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν βραχίονα αὐτοῦ ἔθνη ἐλπιούσιν·*

for when we refer to the parallel section in Justin Martyr (1 *Ap.* 32) we find as follows:—

*καὶ Ἡσαΐας δὲ, ἄλλος προφήτης, τὰ αὐτὰ δι' ἄλλων ῥήσεων προφητεύων, οὕτως εἶπεν, Ἀνατελεῖ ἄστρον ἐξ Ἰακώβ καὶ ἄνθος ἀναθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς ῥίζης Ἰεσσαί· καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν βραχίονα αὐτοῦ ἔθνη ἐλπιούσιν*

(Num. xxiv. 17; Isa. xi. 1; xi. 10),



where the sequence of thought is again preserved for us which occurs in the argument in Irenaeus. And if we read on in Irenaeus, we shall find the words actually extant which he has proleptically treated at the end of c. 57. The order of the passages in the original book can be clearly made out. And the same thing can be shown elsewhere in the new treatise, but for brevity I forbear further reference to this matter.

Here is one other curious and interesting passage in which the treatment of prophecies by Irenaeus is closely parallel to that which we find in Justin, but apparently without any direct dependence of the former upon the latter.

In c. 70, in dealing with Christ's sufferings, Irenaeus quotes from Isaiah liii. 8 ("Who shall declare His generation?"). He then goes on (c. 71) to quote Lamentations iv. 20 under the name of Jeremiah; and then (c. 72) to point out from the same prophet (it should have been Isaiah) "how the righteous perish and no man layeth it to heart; and pious men are taken away" (Isa. lvii. 1); and proceeds to prove from it (i.) the death of Christ, (ii.) the sufferings of those who are His followers; and neither of these points would have been made by a rational exegete; and he concludes thus: "'Who,' says the prophet, 'is perfectly righteous except the Son of God, who leads on those who believe in him to perfect righteousness, *who are persecuted and killed like himself?*'"

Here the parallel in Justin Martyr, 1 *Ap.* 48, is very striking: "And as to the way he pointed out in advance by the prophetic spirit, that he should be done to death *along with those who hope in him*, listen to the things that were spoken by Isaiah," etc.<sup>1</sup>

I do not think that the coincidence, which we here observe

<sup>1</sup> Πῶς τε προμεμήνυται ὑπὸ τοῦ προφητικοῦ πνεύματος ἀναιρεθσόμενος ἅμα τοῖς ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἐλπίζουσιν, ἀκούσατε τῶν λεχθέντων διὰ Ἡσαίου.

in the treatment of the passage in Isaiah at the hands of Irenaeus and Justin, is due to the fact that Irenaeus has been reading Justin; it is more natural to suppose that the treatment of the passage is conventional and is invited by a headline in the Testimony book. But enough has probably been said on this point. The inference which we draw is something more than our previous conclusions: we not only confirm our argument as to the existence of written collections of prophecies used for controversial purposes against the Jews, but since the treatise we have before us is almost the equivalent of a Church Catechism, we see that the Book of Testimonies became a regular book of Church teaching, and that it passed out of controversial use with Jews into doctrinal use for the instruction of Greeks, and that, being so used, it is, as we have said above, the equivalent of a Gospel for the instruction of the catechumens; a little later and it will be displaced by the Gospels themselves, and will rapidly disappear.

Now, in conclusion, we may point out that the anti-Judaic character of the early Apostolical Preaching which Irenaeus is commending to Marcianus is reflected in the ethics of the book, which, although meagre in quantity, are lofty in tone and anti-Judaic in temper. The writer has no further use for the Mosaic Law! Why should we tell a man not to kill, who does not even hate? or not to covet his neighbour's goods when he loves his neighbour as himself? or why tell him to keep an idle day of rest every week, when he keeps every day a Sabbath rest in himself? Is not the true temple the human body, where God is constantly served in righteousness? As for sacrifices, read what Isaiah says about the sacrifice of an ox being the equivalent of the offering of a dog.

Could anything be more characteristically anti-Judaic, or more definitely Christian? And this is the teaching which

professes to present the Apostolical tradition ; it has none of the natural machinery of religion, and very little supernatural machinery ; the terrors of the world to come are as little in evidence as the offerings of bulls and goats. The proportion of the doctrines presented is certainly significant. We should have expected more in this direction and less in that, more in the direction of ritual and less in the direction of ethics unqualified by eschatology. But it would clearly be going too far to assume an argument from silence, and say that Irenaeus had no ritual conceptions, and taught no eschatology. For we have the five books against Heresies to reckon with, as well as a number of preserved fragments from lost books.<sup>1</sup>

It seems clear, however, that the tradition which he presents made much of the interior change and of the spiritual enlightenment. And it is in reference to this spiritual vision and experience that we come nearest to the actual teaching of the New Testament. In c. 93 Irenaeus quotes the famous passage from Hosea (ii. 25), where the Not-Beloved becomes Beloved, and the not-people the children of the living God. For, says he, this is what John the Baptist meant when he said, "God can raise up children to Abraham from the stones." *For after our hearts have been torn away from their stony service and made free, then we behold God by faith and become the children of Abraham, those, namely, who are justified by faith.*

J. RENDEL HARRIS.

<sup>1</sup> It should be noticed that the parallels between the *adv. Haer.* and the *Apostolic Preaching* are constant and often very illuminating. For instance, in c. 14 Irenaeus explains the innocence of Adam and Eve in the garden by the fact that they were created as boy and girl: and, as Harnack notes, this was already implied in *adv. Haer.* iii. 22. 3 (*Erant enim utrique nudi in Paradiso et non confundebantur, quoniam paulo ante facti, non intellectum habebant filiorum generationis: oportebat enim illos primos adolescere, dehinc sic multiplicari*). See also the curious argument for the Virgin Birth in c. 36, based on the promise to David, "Of the fruit of thy body, etc.," and the same argument in *adv. Haer.* iii. 21. 5.

## THE SCRIBES OF THE NAZARENES.

## III. THE REED AND THE COURTIER.

It is written :—

Matt. xi. 7 f.

' Now when these were going  
Jesus began to say  
to the crowds (Dat.)  
concerning John :  
" What did ye come out  
into the wilderness  
to behold ?  
a reed by wind shaken ?

• Well, what did ye come out  
to see ?  
A man in soft things clad ?  
Behold, they that soft things  
wear  
in the houses of the kings.

Luke vii. 24 f.

<sup>24</sup> Now when the messengers  
of John departed  
he began to say  
unto the crowds ( $\pi\rho\acute{o}s$  with Acc.)  
concerning John :  
What have ye come out  
into the wilderness  
to behold ?  
a reed by wind shaken ?

<sup>25</sup> Well, what have ye come out  
to see ?  
a man in soft raiment clad ?  
Behold, they that in glorious  
apparel and luxury exist  
in the palaces are.

THESE two parallel passages constitute a notable example of superficial discrepancy in the extant records of the teaching of Jesus. The suggestion that St. Matthew and St. Luke preserve—not the same but—similar utterances is excluded not only by the verbal identity of their reports of the first and part of the second, but also by their agreement as to the time, place and circumstances.

In such a case it is necessary and legitimate to follow Origen <sup>1</sup>—with a difference—and find a solution in the deeper meaning. <sup>2</sup> But it must be with a difference. For here and elsewhere it would seem that Origen and his followers were apt to regard the two versions as equivalent, and therefore to disregard the modifications deliberately introduced by St. Luke. Such sophistry warps the mind of the apologist generally, and in particular robs him of the apologia and

<sup>1</sup> E.g. in Joh. Tom. x. init.

<sup>2</sup> ἡ ἀναγωγή.

the knowledge, which may be derived from a candid inquiry.

The "deeper meaning" is the cause of St. Luke's departure from the authority, which else he followed, rather than a valid solution of the resultant difficulty. His alterations indicate his own interpretation of this and other "hard sayings," which deserves at least our careful consideration. Steeped in the prophecies of the Old Testament, he, if any of the elders, was capable of selecting for himself or adopting from others the Scripture most appropriate to each oracle of the Lord. The faith of the early Christian Church in the *Scripture and the word which Jesus spake* led them to deliver to their disciples the tradition of the latter, as they themselves had understood it in the light of the former. And in this case the bare riddle is preserved side by side with the secondary form, which has been modified by primitive exegesis.

There is nothing here to suggest the employment of different Greek versions. In each Gospel the setting of the Sayings consists of a Genitive absolute followed by a formula, to which is appended the definition of the persons addressed and the subject with which they are concerned. It is true that St. Luke has *when the messengers of John departed* in place of St. Matthew's vague phrase *when they were going*. But the latter is supported by the words of the command, which they were obeying, "*Going report*"<sup>1</sup>; and the former is sufficiently explained as a possible paraphrase of an ambiguous original, eked out from the context.

In the first Saying the only divergence is the change of tense in St. Luke: *have ye come out* for *did ye come out*. In the second St. Luke rewrites the reply which Jesus gives to his own question, but follows St. Matthew in his report of the question itself.

<sup>1</sup> Matt. xi. 4; Luke vii. 22.



The thesis of my paper is twofold :—

(1) Jesus wished to suggest to the crowds that, by coming out to Him and to John Baptist in the desert, they had relinquished, consciously or unconsciously, the hopes and ideals of Zealot and Herodian.

(2) The sayings were preserved and remodelled in accordance with Scripture, because they were understood to contain a veiled description of the Son of God and His brethren as they are in Heaven.

#### THE FIRST SAYING : THE REED.

The introductory question, *What came ye out into the wilderness to behold?* is commonly taken as referring to some previous occasion, on which these crowds had gone out to John Baptist. It is, however, more natural to suppose that Jesus refers to their present gathering. After all, John is not expressly mentioned as yet. Even the prophecy, *This is he concerning whom it is written, "Behold, I send my messenger,"* despite its familiar application to the Baptist, is indecisive. The description "*more than prophet*" fits Jesus<sup>1</sup> at least as well as John. The traditional interpretation, which rests presumably on the title of the section *concerning John*, need not be excluded altogether, provided that the natural sense is also recognized. The crowds came out into the desert to behold both John and Jesus. Neither of them was *Reed* or *Courtier* : both were *more than Prophet*.

*What came ye out—now or when John Baptist preached—into the wilderness to behold? A reed shaken by the wind?*

No reply to the second question is given. If there were reeds in the desert referred to, we may suppose that Jesus

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Matt. xii. 41 f. = Luke xi. 31 f. : ἰδοὺ πλεῖον Ἰωνᾶ ὧδε . . . ἰδοὺ πλεῖον Σολομῶνος ὧδε.

answered it with a wave of his hand : “ If it is a reed you seek, behold.”

But it must be said that there is no certain foundation for this assumption. A *wilderness* or *desert* is, to speak by the card, a waterless place, and therefore the exact antithesis of a marsh, which is the abode of the reed. So, for example, it is written in the book of Isaiah : *Your God will come and save you. Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened. . . . For in the wilderness shall waters break out and streams in the desert . . . in the habitation of jackals . . . a court for reeds and rushes.*<sup>1</sup>

It is, then, a sign of the *Restoration of all things*, that the thirsty desert should produce reeds. It is true that the various Hebrew words rendered *desert* in the Old Testament do not all necessarily bear this narrow sense. But this prophecy underlies the reply of Jesus to John Baptist’s messengers ; and the original context may, therefore, be fairly adduced as a guide to the exegesis of this complementary saying. It is senseless and futile to look for reeds or courtier in the desert, as the prophet conceived it.

Why, then, does the Lord speak of a reed as a possible or impossible object of their quest ? Two answers may be given to this question, according as one prefers to rest upon the Old Testament or to attempt to reconstruct the original Aramaic words employed.

First, then, to examine the figurative value of the Reed in Scripture. It is applied to Egypt as an untrustworthy ally and to Israel as powerless in the hand of Jehovah.

Of Egypt it is written—

Thus saith the Lord God, “ And all the inhabitants of Egypt shall know that I am the Lord, because they have been a staff of reed to the house of Israel. When they take hold

<sup>1</sup> Isa. xxxv. 4 ff. : LXX . . . ἐκεῖ . . . ἐπαύλεις καλάμου καὶ ἔλη ; Targum  
תמן יסקון קנה וגומא, “ There shall rise up reed and bulrush.”

of thee with the hand, thou dost break, and rend all their shoulder; and when they lean upon thee, thou breakest, and makest all loins to shake.<sup>1</sup>

And again—

Thus saith the king of Assyria, "Lo, thou trustest in the staff of this broken reed, on Egypt; whereon if a man lean, it will go into his hand, and pierce it: so is Pharaoh king of Egypt to all that trust in him."<sup>2</sup>

Of Israel it is said—

Jehovah shall smite Israel as a reed that is shaken in the water.<sup>3</sup>

And again—

Behold, my servant whom I uphold . . . A bruised reed he shall not break.<sup>4</sup>

The former usage suggests that Jesus convicts the crowds of looking to the arm of flesh to save them, untaught by the fatal consequences of this policy in the history of their race. But the description *shaken by wind* points rather to the latter employment of the figure. Neither is inconsistent with the associations inevitably connected with the Aramaic word, which lies behind the Greek.

We proceed then to attempt to reconstruct the original. There can be little doubt that Jesus employed some form of the root *Kānēh*—probably *Kānyā*. If this be so, well might Jesus refer to the Reed as a possible attraction for the crowds. Among the Twelve Disciples was Simon Cananaeus, Simon Kānnā, Simon Zelotes. He at least belonged to the party, who claimed as their own that zeal for God, which distinguished the Heroes of Israel, and arrogated to themselves the title which belonged to their Zealot God.<sup>5</sup> That the dangerous spirit which animated

<sup>1</sup> Ezek. xxix. 6 f.

<sup>2</sup> Isa. xxxvi. 6.

<sup>3</sup> 1 Kings xiv. 15.

<sup>4</sup> Isa. xlii. 1, 3: LXX: κάλαμον τεθλασμένον οὐ συντρίψει.

<sup>5</sup> Exod. xx. 5.

this faction of the Pharisees was present among the band of Jesus' disciples is clear from the incident which followed the healing of the demoniac of Gerasa.<sup>1</sup> In the Histories of Josephus<sup>2</sup> the Zealots appear first as rebels in the days of the census of Cyrenius, A.D. 6. The revolt was crushed for the time—the reed was bruised; but the flax smouldered, until it burst again into flame and finally consumed the Holy City in 70 A.D.

So Jesus warns this disciple, and all who shared his ambition for the political independence of Israel, against the leaven of the Zealots. The warning is contained in a parable. But they whose watchword was zeal, whose title was Kanna, would understand this reference to the reed which is Kanya and the significant silence and wave of the hand which followed it. Once and again the leaven might work in them. Simon Peter was soon to rebuke the Christ for his cowardice, and to act as if he could and would fulfil God's promise, *Sit thou still until I make thine enemies the footstool of thy feet.*

But Simon Kanna never plays the part to which his surname points. He had exulted in the crowds, which came out into the wilderness, as recruits for the army of his dreams. He, Simon Kanna, would have moulded them and led them against the Romans, who usurped God's sovereignty and appeased His priests with a contemptuous toleration of the Law and the Worship. And behold, the Prophet whom he followed and would fain enthrone, speaks to them and to him. He and his have usurped God's prerogative. God's Elect will have none of their aid or defence. The Zealot is a wind-shaken reed.

But yet a little and there is comfort in store for this Reed shaken by reproof, bruised by the chastisement of the comrades, whom he hoped to enlist under the banner of Jesus

<sup>1</sup> See Mark vi. 52 with John vi. 15.

<sup>2</sup> *Ant.* xviii. 1.

the Christ. As Simon, if not as Zealot, he might yet help to establish the Kingdom of Heaven. Human aid is necessary to God and His Christ until the final victory be won : *that it might be fulfilled, which was spoken by Isaiah the prophet, saying . . . A bruised reed shall he not break, and smoking flax he shall not quench*, till he send forth judgment unto victory ; *and in his name shall the Gentiles hope*.<sup>1</sup> He who followed the Fugitive to his doom, no more and no less than his fellows who repudiated the New Model, was an instrument of the Divine purpose. The rejection of the Nation and the Nationalists was the reconciliation of the world.

The original significance, then, of this first Saying may be stated thus : Jesus rebukes the Zealot and those who thought to find in himself or in John Baptist a zealot-leader as one of the Zealots. He probes and exposes their ideals with a play on words. Nevertheless, in the deeper sense there is a hint that these imperfect ideals shall be fulfilled.

But to appreciate this, one must turn to the modifications of the Second Saying about the Courtier, and learn that what is not to be found in John Baptist or in Jesus is present and shall be made manifest at the last in the glorified Christ who sitteth at the right hand of God.

#### THE SECOND SAYING : THE COURTIER.

In St. Matthew's version, which possesses at least a certain relative originality, the reference to the Herodian or Courtier is plain enough.

*Well, what came ye out to see ? A man clothed in soft*

<sup>1</sup> The Greek version of Isa. xlii. 1 ff., cited in Matt. xii. 17-21, strengthens the promise of mercy to the uttermost ; for it has *κάλανον συντετριμμένον οὐ κατέαξει*, "even though it be—not only bruised but—broken, he will not shatter it."



*things? Behold, they that wear the soft things are in the house of kings.*

The crowds who came into the desert were perhaps in search of a Zealot—whether or no they found him. But they would not look to find there a leader taken from the Herodian faction. Nor, probably, would they be ready to serve and follow such an one.

But the language is remarkable, and has given rise to successive interpretations of the Saying. Some of them have affected the report and can therefore be reconstructed.

In the first place, it is to be noticed that the word *malakos*, that is, *soft*, is a strange one to be used in this connexion. The sense required is common enough in “profane” Greek; but in the Greek Bible adjective, noun and verb are all appropriated to that of disease, sickness or effeminacy. If, however, we may venture to reconstruct the Aramaic original, we can readily see why the word was pressed into this new service. The Saying ends with *kings*, that is, *Malkē*. What translator—especially one who shared the belief of his contemporaries in the efficacy of the original sounds—could resist the obvious assonance? What better apparel could there be for the courtier than the *malaka*, which were redolent of the royal presence and of the houses of the *malkē*?

And if the *kings* were not strong enough to suggest the proper Greek equivalent of *the soft raiment, my messenger*, that is *Malaki*, follows below to enforce their appeal for some recognition of the root *MLK*.

Its premature recognition in the word *malaka*, afterthought though it be, secures a perfect antithesis. The crowds came to see not wearers of *malaka*, but *malaki*—God’s messenger. In early days, when Christian missionaries spoke Greek and Aramaic indifferently, such echoes would be noted and prized.

But this is not a matter of sound only, signifying nothing. Even in St. Matthew's report the formula of the answer differs from that of the question, and the difference leads straight to the deeper sense discovered by primitive expositors. The goal suggested is not John Baptist. Did the Lord merely wish to convince the crowds by tender raillery of the futility of trusting to Zealot or Herodian? What was Herodian or Zealot—or Hecuba—to the Christian reader of the [record? All Scripture, of whichever Covenant, must be profitable for edification. Let the *man in soft things clad* be where he will: the Evangelist is concerned with *they that wear soft things*. A Greek hungry to taste and to impart the bread of life, he knows the degradation of the word *malakos*, and believes that, consciously or unconsciously, men are always and everywhere seeking God. These crowds which came out into the wilderness are but types for him. They seek not a Wearer of soft things, a Wearer of silks, but a Bearer of sicknesses. Though they might not realize it fully as yet, they had found Him of whom the prophet had spoken, in all the indignity which belied His glory for a season. It is written, *He was despised and man-forsaken; a man of pains and acquainted with sickness*.<sup>1</sup> And again, *Surely it was our sicknesses He bore*.<sup>2</sup>

So the Greek translator of Isaiah inferred that the Servant of Jehovah was *one who knew how to bear sickness*<sup>3</sup>—*jerein malakian*;—and prompted the variation of phrase, which St. Matthew adopted when he wrote, *they that wear soft things*—*forein malaka*.

But the rest of the Saying is not obviously appropriate to this interpretation. Not in the houses of kings but there in the desert stood the Wearer of diseases. Already Jesus went about healing all manner of sickness among

<sup>1</sup> Isa. liii. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Isa. liii. 4.

<sup>3</sup> εἰδὼς φέρειν μαλακίαν.

the people,<sup>1</sup> and had sent his disciples on the same errand. The inconsistency seems to have attracted the notice of St. Luke. He avoids the phrase which suggested this function of the Incarnate Life.

But it was not *bodily* sicknesses only which Jesus wore or bore. The Prophet foretold that by his death the Servant should bear the sin of many. And the Evangelist knew that the great object of the Incarnation had now been fulfilled by what seemed the final catastrophe. It is the glorified Christ *in the houses of kings*, who *made intercession for the rebellious*—for the sins of the whole world.

The two plurals *wearers* and *kings* present some difficulty. St. Luke, as we shall see, took exception to the latter. It might be justified as referring to the angels who surround the throne and accompany the Son of Man at the Parousia; or again, as proper to the allegory. The former is more serious. St. Luke is content to preserve the form because he has avoided the dangerous words. At first sight it seems to exclude the interpretation which we attribute to early Christian teachers. But their ingenuity was able to conquer greater obstacles than this, when they endeavoured to unveil Christ latent in the Scriptures.<sup>2</sup> It is true that Peter said, *There is none other name under heaven given to men wherein we must be saved.*<sup>3</sup> But St. Paul could speak of himself and his colleagues as the world's scapegoats,<sup>4</sup> and as partners in the travail of the Christ.<sup>5</sup> The Hebrew Jews and the Jews of the Dispersion alike trusted in "the merits of the patriarchs."<sup>6</sup> And if any reject as Jewish

<sup>1</sup> Matt. iv. 23, ix. 35, x. 1.

<sup>2</sup> See, e.g., Epistle of Barnabas, the works of Clement of Alexandria and Origen *passim*.

<sup>3</sup> Acts iv. 12.

<sup>4</sup> 1 Cor. iv. 13; cf. Rom. ix. 3.

<sup>5</sup> Col. i. 24.

<sup>6</sup> See Philo, *Concerning Curses*, ix., and compare Rom. xi. 16, 28.

fables the intercession of Abraham and Jeremiah, warrant may be found for this plural in the fact of the Mission of the Twelve: *He gave them authority over unclean spirits to cast them out and to heal all disease and all sickness.*<sup>1</sup>

In the Gospel according to St. Luke the original is faithfully preserved as far as the end of the second question; but the reply becomes, *They that in glorious apparel and luxury exist in the palaces are.* By this paraphrase all difficulties are removed and the spiritual interpretation revealed. The true Herodian is not Jesus here in the desert but Christ in heaven—why seek the living among the dead?

*Soft things*, with their suggestion of human sins, are become *glorious apparel*. For the Christ once offered to bear away the sins of many a second time apart from sin shall appear . . . having offered one sacrifice for sins, *He sat down for ever at God's right hand.*<sup>2</sup>

The glorious apparel belongs to God Himself, as it is written: *The Lord is King: he hath put on glorious apparel.* He has said, *My glory will I not give to another.*<sup>3</sup> But the prophets had visions, now of one like a son of man, now of many saints to whom God entrusted His Kingdom.<sup>4</sup> Of the many the Sage said after Daniel: *The just shall receive the kingdom of beauty.*<sup>5</sup> And of the one it is written: *Who is this that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah? This that is glorious in his apparel, travelling in the greatness of his strength? I that speak in righteousness, mighty to save.*<sup>6</sup> Here at last is the Scripture

<sup>1</sup> Matt. x. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Heb. ix. 28, x. 12.

<sup>3</sup> Isa. xlii. 8.

<sup>4</sup> Dan. vii. 18, 22.

<sup>5</sup> Sap. v. 16: οἱ δίκαιοι . . . λήμψονται τὸ βασίλειον τῆς εὐπρεπειας.

<sup>6</sup> Isa. lxiii. 1.

which explained this Word of Jesus, magnifying and not destroying the original reference to Herod the king. If any hope to find in him the deliverer of Israel, let them learn with the Zealot this lesson:—all their heroes are but types of the Messiah who came once as Jesus of Nazareth.

Coming like Herod from Edom,<sup>1</sup> another and a greater Hadar succeeds to a higher throne. For he is the true *Hadar*, *glorious in apparel* as in name. But the Christ must suffer and so enter into his glory. Therefore He comes from Edom, which is being interpreted the red place of blood. He comes with dyed garments from Bosor which is the Flesh, which He assumed. With the shedding of his blood came the remission of all sins. For Him and for those whom God gave Him, the silks were outworn: by him the sicknesses had been borne away for ever.

The word *luxury* (τρυφή) soon explains itself. It is the standard rendering of *Eden* in the Greek Old Testament upon which St. Luke is so dependent. The Garden of Eden is the Paradise of Luxury. There God placed the first Adam<sup>2</sup> in the beginning; and thence expelled him for his transgression. Thither the second Adam returns in a figure, bringing with him the many, whom his obedience justified. So He said to the penitent thief, *To-day thou shalt be with me in Paradise*.<sup>3</sup>

Once more the glorified Christ is contrasted sharply with Christ Incarnate. *The second Adam*, who is in Luxury, is *a quickening spirit, the heavenly man*.<sup>4</sup> And His glory is reflected in those who wear His image and become like Him<sup>5</sup>—the saints of the Church Triumphant.

*Existing* or *subsisting* (ὑπάρχοντες) recalls another pro-

<sup>1</sup> The history of the kings of Edom which is contained in Gen. xxxvi. is incomplete; but even there it is written, "And Baal-hanan the son of Achbor died, and *Hadar* reigned in his stead."

<sup>2</sup> Gen. ii. 15.

<sup>3</sup> Luke xxiii. 43.

<sup>4</sup> 1 Cor. xv. 45 ff.

<sup>5</sup> 1 Cor. xv. 49; 2 Cor. iii. 18; 1 John iii. 2.



phcey and also a saying of the Apostle Paul. The one endorses its application to the companions of the glorified Christ ; the other, its use of Christ Himself. Both passages are familiar to Christians of all ages.

Micah said : *Out of thee, Bethlehem, shall come forth one to be governor of Israel . . . and he shall stand and see ; and Jehovah shall shepherd his flock. And in the glory of Jehovah their God shall they subsist (ὑπάρξουσιν) ; for now he shall be magnified unto the ends of the earth.*<sup>1</sup> St. Paul said, *Christ Jesus, subsisting in the form of God . . . humbled himself. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted Him.*<sup>2</sup>

Later and more clearly Jesus repeated this warning against Zealot and Herodian. Neither had a gospel for the Nation, which was as truly as these crowds or the followers of Moses, in the wilderness. They must *beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of Herod.*<sup>3</sup> For the Zealots cannot be distinguished from the Pharisees save by one like Josephus, who, professing Pharisaism, would live at peace under heathen domination. But the ideals of both parties, Nationalist and Hellenist alike, were destined to be realized in Christianity.

Shaken once by the wind, which is the Spirit, clad now in royal robes, the exalted Jesus Christ sits in the Palace of the great King—the true Zealot and the true Herodian.

J. H. A. HART.

## PISIDIAN ANTIOCH.

### VI. CHARACTER OF THE ORIGINAL HELLENIC CITY.

APART from the few facts mentioned in the preceding Sections—facts inferred from inscriptions of the Roman period—the history of the old Hellenic city Antioch is

<sup>1</sup> Micah v. 2 ff. (LXX).

<sup>2</sup> Phil. ii. 5 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Mark viii. 15.

extremely obscure. Strabo mentions that in 189 B.C., when the Seleucid power over Asia Minor was destroyed, Antioch was made a free city by the Romans. For 150 years it seems to have remained in this condition, a self-governing sovereign state, maintaining the Hellenic system of autonomy and education in the borderland between the servile country of Phrygia and the free but barbarous Pisidian mountain-tribes. We can only vaguely infer what was the spirit of the city in this period, for not a single memorial is preserved above ground, though doubtless excavation would disclose in a deeper stratum monuments which belong to that earlier time.

The facts from which we have to judge are the following. In the first place, it continued to feel itself a Hellenic city. It never sank back to the level of a mere Oriental and Phrygian town. Centuries later we find that its people spoke of themselves as Magnesians residing in Phrygia<sup>1</sup>: Magnesians the origin of the Greek colony was still living in their minds. The same thought was fresh in the memory of the surrounding population when Strabo travelled across Asia Minor, and passed through Philomelion, the city on the other side of the lofty ridge of Sultan-Dagh.

The geographer did not visit Antioch or see it with his own eyes: he only heard about it as situated on the opposite side of the mountains from Philomelion. His description of the two cities and of the intervening mountain-ridge shows clearly that he knew only the Philomelian side, and assimilated in imagination the Antiochian side, which he had not seen, to the side which he knew. On the latter side the landscape is a deep-lying, perfectly level valley from which rises sharp and steep the great ridge of Sultan-Dagh. On the Antiochian side there is neither a level valley nor a definite mountain ridge: it is only in the more

<sup>1</sup> A single example is sufficient proof of the general custom: see EXPOSITOR, January, 1907, p. 83 (misunderstood by Kaibel, Kern, etc.).

distant view from the west that the continuity and grandeur of Sultan-Dagh is realized : the country near the mountains is very rough and undulating, with ridges of hills considerable in size, which reach back to merge themselves gradually in the superior mass of Sultan-Dagh.

Strabo's description, therefore, is founded, not on what the Antiochians thought of themselves, but on what other townspeople beyond the mountains thought of them. He describes it as a free Hellenic city, and this means a great deal ; it implies free institutions, elective form of self-government, popular assemblies, and above all a certain well-established system of education for the young, which was continued throughout their later life by their experience as citizens and voters, producing in them a general knowledge of and interest in political facts and in questions of domestic and foreign policy, on which they had often to vote in the Assembly or Ekklesia—and producing in them also a pride of birth as Magnesians, a pride of education as Hellenes, and a contempt for the slavish Oriental Phrygians or the barbarous Pisidians. All this has to be inferred, but can be inferred with perfect confidence. Excavations to prove the facts by the discovery of written documents of the period are much to be desired.

The only epigraphic evidence which bears on the history of the first Antioch is an imperfect inscription found at Magnesia on the Meander, the parent-city of Antioch : this document is one of a long series of decrees passed by many Hellenic cities in recognition of the privileges of the Magnesian goddess Artemis. In one of the decrees, where the name of Antioch occurs without any distinguishing epithet, Kern (who has published the whole series) understands that the document emanated from Pisidian Antioch ; and there can be no question that he has good reason for doing so.<sup>1</sup> These decrees were made during the last years

<sup>1</sup> O. Kern, *Die Inschriften von Magnesia*, no. 80.

of the third century before Christ in response to courteous messages conveyed by Magnesians ambassadors to the leading Hellenic cities of Asia and of Greece, and among others to Pisidian Antioch.

This decree in honour of the Magnesian Artemis entirely confirms the account which we have given of Antioch, proving that it was recognized as a Hellenic city by its neighbours, that it remembered its relation to its parent-city and acknowledged its obligations to Hellenism generally.

This event belongs to the third century before Christ ; but there is no reason to think that the Hellenic spirit died out in the following century. Antioch lay on a great commercial highway. It was in easy and constant communication with many other Hellenic cities, accessible readily to ambassadors from them (such as had brought the request from Magnesia regarding the worship of Artemis), and this intercourse exercised a strong influence in maintaining the spirit of Hellenism. The whole course of contemporary history shows that Hellenism was an undiminished power at that time in Western Asia. The whole burden of proof would lie with one who asserted that Hellenism died out in Antioch during the last two centuries before Christ, for the assertion is contrary to all the probabilities of the case and the analogy of other west-Asian centres of Hellenism.

In 39 B.C. Antioch, with Apollonia and the whole of Pisidia and Phrygia adjoining Pisidia, was given by Antony to Amyntas the last king of Galatia ; and thus this large district became part of the Galatian realm. While Antioch now ceased to be a free city, it is not probable that any serious change was made in its internal affairs. It was no longer a sovereign state ; it ceased to have a foreign policy ; it was controlled by the king, and probably paid tribute to him. But all analogy points to the opinion that

it continued to administer its own internal affairs by its own elected magistrates. In any case the kingly period was too short to affect seriously the spirit of the city, for Amyntas was soon killed in battle against the Pisidian mountaineers ; and he bequeathed his whole property and realm to the Roman Empire.

#### VII. THE ROMAN COLONY OF PISIDIAN ANTIOCH.

A new period in the history of Antioch began in 25 B.C., when the country passed into the possession of Rome at the death of Amyntas. The city was then made a Roman Colony. The date of the foundation is not recorded, and absolute certainty cannot be attained ; but there can be little doubt that the statement which is usually made by the numismatists is correct, and that the establishment of the Colony took place as soon as the Roman dominion over the kingdom of Amyntas, which now became the Province Galatia, was organized. The name *Caesareia Antiocheia*, by which the city was henceforth designated, marks it as separate from the other Pisidian Colonies, which were all called *Julia*, most of them *Julia Augusta*<sup>1</sup> ; and if its foundation belonged to a different time, it must have been earlier and not later than them. Now the other Pisidian Colonies were founded about 7-6 B.C., and probably are connected with the government of Quirinius (Cyrenius), who commanded the armies of the Province Syria in the war against the Pisidian mountaineers at that time.<sup>2</sup> Antioch, being older, may therefore safely be connected with the first organization of the new Province.

It was a real elevation in rank and dignity that was conferred on the Hellenic city Antioch, when it was constituted and refounded as a Roman colony. It was thus placed in

<sup>1</sup> They are *Coloniae Julia Augusta Olbasena*, *Julia Augusta Prima Fida Comama*, *Julia Augusta Felix Cremnensium* (or *Cremna*), *Julia Felix Gemina Lustra* (the omission of *Augusta* may perhaps be accidental in our authorities), *Julia Augusta Parlais*.

<sup>2</sup> See the proof stated in *Christ Born at Bethlehem*, p. 238 ff.



the highest class of provincial cities : it was made, so to say, a piece of the imperial city, a detached fragment of Rome itself, separated by space, but peopled by *coloni*, who were of equal standing and privileges in the eye of the law with the citizens of Rome—*cives optimo iure*, according to the technical formula.

The *coloni*, or citizens of the *colonia*, new inhabitants introduced from the West, for the most part veteran soldiers of the legion *Alauda*,<sup>1</sup> must be clearly and broadly distinguished from the older Hellenic population, who now ranked only as dwellers (*incolae*) in their own city, and who did not possess the same rank and rights as the *coloni*. The former did not forthwith become Roman citizens and *coloni* ; the latter were Roman citizens in their own right before they became *coloni*. But still even the old Hellenic citizens had some share from the first in the increased dignity of the city. They were certainly on a more favoured and honoured footing than the citizens of ordinary Hellenic cities. They, probably, were freed from direct taxation and enjoyed some other privileges ; but no evidence remains on the spot, and it is not possible to do more than speak in general terms from the analogy of the *incolae* in other Roman *coloniae*. Their most important privilege, however, lay in the future : they had a more favourable opportunity than the citizens in ordinary Hellenic cities of attaining the coveted honour of the Roman citizenship. The success of the Roman government in permanently conciliating the loyalty of the provincial population<sup>2</sup> was founded on the settled principle of Imperial administration, according to which the peoples were regarded as being all in a process of education and training to fit them for the honourable estate

<sup>1</sup> So called from the lark, *alauda*, which was the mark or crest distinguishing it.

<sup>2</sup> The cessation of war and the inauguration of peace at the first established the Empire in the affections of the Provinces (especially of the East) ; but only good administration could have made this favour permanent.

of full Roman citizenship. The ultimate destiny of the Empire was that all freemen should attain this honourable position; and that destiny was achieved, perhaps rather prematurely, by Caracalla about A.D. 212; but, whether or not he hurried on the final stage too rapidly, this was the goal to which the Imperial policy had been tending from the beginning. As a first stage the outer nations were commonly placed under the rule of client kings, whose duty it was not merely to preserve order, but to instil a habit and spirit of orderliness into their subjects and to naturalize among them the first principles of Roman systematic method in government. After a certain time of such training the people was reckoned worthy of being formed into a Roman Province.<sup>1</sup> Such was the history of Palestine under Herod, of Pontus under Polemon, of Galatia under Amyntas, of Cilicia Tracheia under Antiochus IV., and of many other countries.<sup>2</sup> When a new Province like Galatia was organized, its different parts and cities were variously treated according to their fitness for the duties of loyal service to the Empire. The most backward parts were left in the old tribal condition, as was, for example, the case with the Homonades, who had killed Amyntas and were at a later time subdued by Quirinius: at a much later time such tribes generally received the city organization. The city was the proper unit in Roman administration; and wherever there existed a Hellenic city in the new Province, it was made a city in the Roman system and a unit in the Province. In such a city the most influential, wealthy and energetic citizens were gradually elevated to the Roman citizenship; and these formed a city aristocracy, whose weight and authority in the city rested on wealth, privilege,

<sup>1</sup> The essential and fundamental fact in the Roman Province was not the territory, but the people; hence the Greek translation of Provincia was τὸ ἔθνος, the nation; Provincia Asia is rendered ἡ Ἀσία τὸ ἔθνος by Strabo.

<sup>2</sup> The process is described in *Christ Born at Bethlehem*, p. 120 ff.

energy and ability. The highest and most honoured class of cities in the Province consisted of the *Coloniae*. These began with a considerable body of Roman citizens,<sup>1</sup> and the whole tone and spirit was thereby affected and Romanized. The amusements, the public exhibitions, the education, were more Roman: so also were the magistrates, the public language, the law and the institutions generally. In this Roman atmosphere the rest of the population, the *incolae*, lived and moved; they imbibed the Roman tone, adopted Roman manners, learned the Latin tongue, and were promoted to the Roman citizenship more freely and quickly than were the people of Hellenic cities. In most cases, probably in almost every case, Roman citizenship was made universal among the free population (including the original inhabitants of the city) at an early date.<sup>2</sup> That seems to have been the case at Antioch. The inscriptions, Greek and Latin alike, show no trace of Hellenes, but only of Romans. Every free inhabitant of the city, of whom epigraphic record survives, bears the full Roman name, which marks him as a Roman citizen.<sup>3</sup> This seems to constitute a complete proof that the entire city became Roman at a comparatively early date, though later than the Pauline period.

Wherever and whenever the number of Roman citizens became large, their position as a local aristocracy necessarily suffered. It was no longer possible to maintain that standard of wealth on which the influence of an aristocracy must be supported. Under the early Empire, when there were in an Eastern city only a few Roman citizens, some of Italian origin, others representing the leading families of the

<sup>1</sup> A different class occurs later, *EXPOSITOR*, September, 1905, p. 212f.

<sup>2</sup> One would be disposed to conjecture that Lystra was an exception. Its use as a *colonia* soon ceased; the Roman blood and tone were much weaker there than in Antioch, and perhaps died out naturally during the later second century.

<sup>3</sup> One or two apparent exceptions, such as the magistrate Sekoundos in Sterrett, *Epigr. Journ.*, No. 96, belong to the third century, when Roman names were losing their clear form. Sekoundos was a Roman, Secundus.

city, these formed a true aristocracy in the city. But when all freemen became Roman citizens in A.D. 212, there was no longer any distinction ; there were no people to whom the Roman citizens could be superior except the slaves. The lines of class distinction in the third and later centuries were drawn anew. It was no longer an honour to bear the three names of a Roman, for all had an equal right to the three names ; and the old system of Roman personal names gradually ceased to be attended to or maintained. A new period and new fashions had begun.

To a certain extent a similar change took place in Pisidian Antioch, when the whole free population of the city attained the honour of Roman citizenship ; and this honour necessarily ceased to be an object for the older population to aim at. But the lustre of Roman citizenship did not disappear, for though all free Antiochians were now Romans, yet the surrounding world of Phrygia and Pisidia still remained outside the pale of Roman citizenship, and thus all the Antiochian Romans could feel their superiority to the mass of the Provincials ; they were proud that Antioch was a Roman town, a part of the great governing imperial city.

When did this change take place ? When were all the old population of Antioch raised to the rank of Romans ? It is not possible to specify the date ; but one cannot suppose it was much, if at all, earlier than the second century. The cities of Spain were honoured by Vespasian with mere Latin rank, a step on the way to Roman rank, in A.D. 74. The full Roman honour was accorded to Antioch probably later, and not earlier. Hence we must conclude that in the time of St. Paul's visits to Antioch, the mass of his hearers were still not Roman citizens, but they all looked forward to that rank as a possible honour to be attained in the future. The mere presence in their city of a considerable Italian population gave them higher privileges and was a distinction to all the inhabitants of every class. Even those who



were not Romans were on the way to become Romans in course of time, as a reward of merit and loyalty.

Not merely gratitude for the past and hope for their future made the Antiochian population strong philo-Roman, but also the keen sense of daily advantages produced the same result. As chief city of the southern half of the Province Galatia, Antioch was the governing centre of a large country ; it was frequently visited by the Roman governors of the Province <sup>1</sup> with their large train of attendants (which would cause considerable influx of money into the city and thus tend to enrich the merchants and shopkeepers) ; great public exhibitions of games and wild beasts and gladiators were held there, which would attract large numbers of visitors and sightseers, all spending money freely ; the courts of justice held by the governors in the city, likewise, brought to the city many litigants and enriched the population. The description given by Dion Chrysostom in his oration delivered at Apameia-Celaenae of the crowds and the wealth which the position of the city as a leading Roman centre of administration brought to Apameia may be applied to Antioch in a higher degree. The dignity and the wealth of almost every person in Antioch depended mainly on its position as a Roman city in the Province Galatia ; and its provincial standing was the most important factor in its history during the first century. Hence " the Province," i.e. Rome as it appeared in the land,<sup>2</sup> must have bulked largely in the minds of the Antiochian populace ; and, if the Church of Antioch claimed to represent its city,<sup>3</sup> it felt itself to be a Church of Galatia.

The tale of St. Thekla, when read in the light of Dion

<sup>1</sup> Probably each of the numerous inscriptions in honour of Governors of Galatia marks a visit paid by the official in question to the city.

<sup>2</sup> On the aspect of the " Province " in Asia Minor, see the *Letters to the Seven Churches*, p. 103, about the Province Asia as the Beast that came up from the earth.

<sup>3</sup> Our view is that such was always the claim of the Church.



Chrysostom's orations, gives a picture of the assemblage which gathered at a great festival of the Imperial religion, presided over by a high priest of the Emperor.

The outward appearance of the city was made as Roman as possible. Instead of the old classification into Tribes, the population and the town were divided into *Vici*: the names of six of these are known, and they are purely and obtrusively Roman, *Patricius*, *Aedilicius*, *Tusculus*, *Velabrus*, *Cermalus*, *Salutaris*—among them several of the most famous street-names of Rome—and it is a plausible conjecture of Professor Sterrett that there were twelve *vici* as there are twelve quarters (*mahale*) in the modern town. The magistrates were those usual in Roman *coloniae*, *duoviri*, *iure dicundo* and *Quinquennales*, *aediles*, *quaestors* and *curators*. There was a priesthood of Jupiter, *Optimus Maximus* and one or more *flamens*. The senators were called *decuriones*, the senate was an *Ordo*.

The tale of St. Thekla affords the proof that exhibitions in which criminals were exposed to wild beast (euphemistically called *venationes*) were usual; such exhibitions were never as popular in Greek as in Roman cities. The *Ordo* and the *Populus* concurred in paying honours to distinguished citizens or strangers, instead of the *Boulé* and *Demos* of a Greek city. The *Populus* seems to have expressed its will more by acclamation in the theatre than by formal voting in public meetings.

#### VIII. DESIGNATION OF THE ANTIOCHIANS BY LUKE.

It is in agreement with the facts just mentioned that the population of Antioch are not called Hellenes or Greeks, but only the Gentiles or the Nations. The latter is a wider term, which included at once Greeks and Romans and Phrygians and other native races. In Iconium and Thessalonica and Beroea and Corinth<sup>1</sup> the Greeks are men-

<sup>1</sup> Only the Greek women at Beroea are mentioned. As regards Corinth

tioned, which is quite in accordance with the character of those cities ; when, however, the entire population of Iconium and of Thessalonica is mentioned, it is summed up in Iconium as " the Gentiles," and at Thessalonica as " the mob," " the rabble." <sup>1</sup> In the Colonia Lystra <sup>2</sup> the general mass of the population is clearly marked as Lycaonian (see xiv. 11), though there were some Hellenes in the city (see xvi. 1, 4) who were natives of the country by race, but educated in Greek manners and language. When the general population of Lystra is summed up in one expression, it is called " the mob." This also is in perfect accord with what is known from other sources about that little Roman colony planted in an old Lycaonian town ; the Graeco-Roman civilization and education had permeated it only to a small degree.

In passing, we must point out that it was, doubtless, in the higher strata of the Lystran population that the Western customs and language first established themselves ; this must be regarded as proving that Timothy, whose father was a Greek and whose mother was a Jewess, sprang from a family of some wealth and good standing in Lystra ; and the words of Luke, that Timothy " was well reported of by the brethren in Iconium," and that all the Jews in other cities knew that his father was a Greek, show that he was not an obscure individual of the humbler rank, but a person whose name and position were widely known. This is only one of the many incidental details which prove that most of the important figures in the early centuries of Christianity sprang from the educated higher-middle class of Anatolia, the local gentry,<sup>3</sup> whose position opened to them the path

see Acts xviii. 4, and the Bezan reading in xviii. 17, " all the Greeks laid hold of Sosthenes."

<sup>1</sup> ὄχλος corresponds to the Latin " plebs " ; sometimes the plural is used in Acts, sometimes the singular.

<sup>2</sup> Strictly the Latin name was Lustra, not Lystra : the change sought to give a Latin appearance and meaning to the Lycaonian name Lystra or Listra. <sup>3</sup> See *Pauline and Other Studies*, p. 376.

of education, from which the mere peasantry were debarred.

Lystra was never so strongly Romanized as Antioch. The proportion of Italian settlers was probably smaller, and the circumstances were not so well calculated to keep the Roman connexion so clearly before the attention of the city. Yet even in Lystra the fact that the colonial character alone gave it any importance, and that before and apart from the Roman connexion it was a mere uneducated, rude Lycaonian town, made the population found their municipal pride on their position as a Roman colonia, and strive to write their epitaphs and other documents in Latin, sometimes so rudely and badly as to be partly unintelligible. Hence the mixture of races is far more clearly perceptible in the Lystran narrative than in the Antiochian.

Corinth is marked as a Greek town in xviii. 4 and perhaps xviii. 17 (Bezan text). It was a Roman colonia, and the individual names which are mentioned are chiefly Latin, as appears both in *Acts* and in the *Epistles*. But one can understand that, in the position of the city as the capital of Greece and as one of the most important trading cities of the Levant and Aegean seas, the Greek spirit and language were necessarily strong in it. We should, however, not have expected that the population should be called Greeks; but we must infer that the Greek feeling was stronger in Corinth than in Pisidian Antioch, which after all is not unnatural or out of harmony with the rest of our knowledge. In one case (xviii. 7) the entire population is called by Luke "the Corinthians."

Considering how much importance was attached by ancient feeling to the method of designating a group of citizens, and how much of compliment lay in the use of a generic term that implied the sovereign character of their state, we must find it a noteworthy fact, and most suggestive fact, that the only cities of the Greek world whose popula-

tion Luke designates by the complimentary and strictly Greek title are Athens and Corinth : only in those cities does he use the term " men of Corinth " or " men of Athens," and he sums up the population of Athens quite in the technical Greek formula as the " Athenians and the strangers that dwell among them." These were the two capital cities of Greece : the old intellectual head of the country, still the leading University city of the world, and the new capital of the land.

In Ephesus Luke makes the Ephesian agitators speak of themselves as Ephesians : the Secretary of the State addresses the populace as Ephesians (just as Paul addressed his audience in Athens as Athenians) ; most striking of all the letter introducing Apollos was written by the Ephesians to the disciples in Corinth. It is natural that the Ephesian populace and orators addressing them should use the complimentary title ; and it is an interesting indication of the claim which the Church in Ephesus was making at such an early stage in its history to speak as representative of the city that it wrote as " the Ephesians to the disciples in Corinth."<sup>1</sup>

At Philippi Luke never names the general population of the colonia, but only mentions the magistrates and a few individuals.

These examples show how much appropriateness is observable in Luke's varying ways of designating the population of different cities <sup>2</sup> ; his usage is all drawn from living facts, not from dead history. His avoidance of the term " Antiochians " or " Iconians " is not accidental, but arises from instinctive perception of a certain unsuitability.

<sup>1</sup> That Paul should address the Church of the Thessalonians or should appeal to the Korinthians in an impassioned apostrophe (2 Cor. vi. 11) is not nearly so notable a fact as this at Ephesus.

<sup>2</sup> The topographical designation by Luke of a man as Derbaean or Corinthian, and of two men as Thessalonians, does not belong to the present subject.

Similarly his avoidance of the expression "the Hellenes" at Antioch and his use of it at Iconium and Corinth are due to correct instinct.

#### IX. HELLENISM IN PISIDIAN ANTIOCH.

While the spirit and tone of Roman loyalty was thus dominant in Pisidian Antioch during the first century, there is no reason to think that Hellenic civilization and manners were entirely displaced by Roman. It is much to be desired that excavation should be made on the site, in order to give some clear objective evidence on this point; but analogy and general considerations tend to show that Greek ways and Greek education must have maintained themselves in the city, even while the Roman spirit was most thoroughly dominant. Rome was never hostile to Greek custom and Greek law in the East: it recognized that in Asia Greek civilization was an ally, not an enemy, nor even a competitor. The civilization which Rome sought to spread over western Asia was bilingual. Accordingly all probability points to the opinion that Greek was the familiar language spoken at Antioch in the home life, except among the Italian immigrant or colonist families, and, even among these, the knowledge of Greek gradually spread in course of time. Thus it came about that as the Roman vigour died and the Oriental spirit revived, during the third century, Greek seems to have become the practically universal language of the Antiochian population, though some few inscriptions of government were written in Latin as late as the fourth century. Hence also it is quite in accordance with the circumstances, that Greek was the language used in the synagogue.

To trace the disuse of Latin and the recurrence to Greek as the public and formal language of the *Coloniæ* would be a useful task, but as yet this cannot be essayed. Though the inscriptions are numerous, no regular system of dating



them was ever employed in Antioch and no era seems ever to have been used there. The want of any chronological system here shows by contrast how useful even a bad system of dating by some local era was in many cities of Asia Minor ; still more, how important a step was made when a uniform era of the Province came into general use throughout a whole region, as, for example, in the cities of Asian Phrygia, or when the Seleucid era, reckoning from 312 B.C., was brought into widespread employment in the Seleucid Empire and lasted in some parts of Syria for many centuries. This invention of a useful general system of chronology was one of those apparently small things which lie in reality at the basis of the social fabric and help to form the foundations on which educated society rests. It was in the Græco-Asiatic cities that this important advance in the methodical organization of society was made : it was among them that common employment of a uniform era for a large country was first carried into practical effect. The purely Greek cities thought it a point of honour to employ a purely municipal system of dating by the name of the annual magistrates of the city where the document was executed. This Greek method, which naturally was unintelligible beyond the limits of the single city, was put in practice in Rome ; and, owing to the wide Imperial sway of Rome, the dates by consuls became generally intelligible over the Empire, though such a complicated system formed a serious bar to practical usefulness, as it gave no indication of the interval that lay between any two dates.

Neither Latin nor Greek inscriptions in Antioch were dated by any system or in any way. A number of the Latin documents, however, can be assigned to a narrow period or a definite reign by internal evidence and the mention of some known person, but the Greek inscriptions are almost all quite vague, and internal evidence is rarely of any use for dating them. The lettering furnishes little

evidence under the middle and later Empire, for forms were at that period employed capriciously and without any uniformity or principle of development.

The Greek dedication by the colonia Lystra of a statue of Concord to its sister colonia Antiocheia<sup>1</sup> may be taken as one of the earliest public documents written in Greek in the whole Antiochian series. Lystra lost the knowledge and power of using Latin earlier than Antioch (as has been pointed out above). Lystra would also have been very chary of using Greek when it was addressing its sister colonia, and claiming kinship with Antioch the metropolis of the Province; and we must infer that it no longer possessed, when this inscription was composed, the ability to write Latin and engrave a document in that language. Now, Latin was employed in Lystra for inscriptions at least as late as the reign of Trajan, A.D. 98.<sup>2</sup> The dedication of the statue of Concord, therefore, could not be dated earlier than about 150 A.D. On the other hand, the event probably took place while the colonial character of Lystra was still recognized in both cities. It might be connected with the attempt which seems to have been made in the time of Antoninus Pius (138–161 A.D.) to revive the colonial memory by striking colonial coins (which had almost ceased since the early Empire); but those coins were struck in Latin, and the Antiochian dedication, therefore, is not likely to be much, if at all, earlier than about 200 A.D.

None of the other Greek inscriptions of colonial times seem to be earlier than this, and therefore they may all be assigned with considerable confidence to the third and fourth centuries after Christ.

Through these public documents in the Greek language we trace the recurrence of the Oriental spirit in the Græco-Roman cities, but it is Orientalism under Greek forms, not

<sup>1</sup> Sterrett, *Wolfe Exped.*, no. 352.

<sup>2</sup> Rev. H. S. Cronin in *Journal of Hellenic Studies* (1904), p. 114.

under the old purely native forms : it is really a mixture of Asiatic and Greek tone, rejecting only the more purely European tone of Rome, which had not assimilated, but only dominated the East. Domination of one by the other is an impossible basis on which to arrange an amalgamation of East and West. Greek civilization, on the contrary, had adapted itself to the Eastern races and coalesced with Orientalism in a mixed Græco-Asiatic system of law and custom ; out of this union sprang many of the improved methods in social administration which were taken up and put in practice by the Roman Imperial government.

In this way the later Roman Antioch gradually ceased to be a Roman city, and took on the character of a Græco-Asiatic city. It styled itself no longer a *Colonia*, but in Greek as a *Metropolis*. Its magistrates gradually disused the Latin title *duumvir* and took the Greek title *strategos*.<sup>1</sup> The Senate no longer called itself an *Ordo*, but a *Boulê*. These changes are not merely a matter of outward names ; they are the outward indication of a deep-lying and complete change of spirit. The Roman spirit was dying out, and the Provinces were establishing their supremacy in the administration of the whole Imperial body.<sup>2</sup>

These facts, though belonging to a later time, indicate the permanent vitality of the Greek civilization in Antioch, underlying the Roman character which was so triumphant in appearance during the first century. A right instinct led Paul to appeal in Greek to the Greek side of Antiochian feeling ; but the facts of the city at the moment guide the historian and prevent him from using the term *Hellenes* about the auditors to whom Paul appealed.

W. M. RAMSAY.

<sup>1</sup> It is an interesting parallel that when the Greek Luke describes the action in the Roman *Colonia Philippi*, he calls the *duumvirs* *strategoi* (also using the general term *archontes* or *magistrates*).

<sup>2</sup> On this subject, compare *Studies in the Art and History of the Eastern Provinces* (Hodder & Stoughton, 1906), pp. 4 ff., 282, 287, 357 ff.

## VIRGIL AND ISAIAH :

### AN INQUIRY INTO THE SOURCES OF THE FOURTH ECLOGUE OF VIRGIL.<sup>1</sup>

THE editors of Virgil seem content for the most part to regard this poem as merely a hyperbolical expression of the hope that the agreement made at Brundisium between Antony and Octavius in the year 40 B.C. might put an end to the civil strife from which Rome had so long suffered. The few who have made any attempt to account for the special features of the new era foretold by the poet have usually assumed without proof that these features were capable of explanation out of the commonplaces of Greek or Roman literature, and that there is nothing to justify Merivale's assertion<sup>2</sup> that "the glowing language in which the reign of happiness is depicted appropriates almost every image, and breathes some portion of the spirit, of the Messianic predictions." I propose to consider in this paper how far it is true that parallels for these images are to be found in pagan literature, and, if they are not to be found, whether it is possible to trace them back to a Jewish origin. I will begin with an examination of the line in which Virgil appears to disclose to his readers where he found his materials—

Ultima Cumaei venit iam carminis aetas.

<sup>1</sup> This paper was written as a sort of appendix to a sermon entitled "Teste David cum Sibylla," which is included in a volume recently published by Mr. Francis Griffiths. Through the kindness of the Editor it is inserted here as offering some points of more general interest.

<sup>2</sup> *Hist. of the Empire*, vol. iii. p. 231.

The learned Fabricius, in his *Bibliotheca Graeca*, vol. i. p. 181, followed by J. Geffcken, the latest and in some respects the best editor of the *Oracula Sibyllina*, maintains that we have here an allusion to the Ages of men described in the *Works and Days* of Hesiod, whose father migrated from Cyme in Asia Minor to Boeotia, and who might therefore be himself styled Cumaeus. But is this a natural interpretation? Is there any other example of the epithet Cumaeus being applied to Hesiod? We should gather from Hesiod's own words (l. 650) that he was born after the removal to Boeotia, as he tells us that the crossing from Aulis to Euboea was the longest voyage he had ever made. In any case he wrote his poems at Ascræ, near Mount Helicon, and is accordingly referred to by Virgil as "Ascræus senex" (*Ecl.* vi. 70), by Propertius (iii. 32. 77) as "Ascræus poeta," by Ovid (*Am.* i. 15. 11) as "Ascræus" simply, while the phrase "Ascræum carmen" is used as a synonym for pastoral poetry in general in *Georg.* ii. 176. On the other hand, Virgil's thoughts were much occupied with the Sibyl of the Italian Cumæ, a city which is said to have been the oldest of the Greek colonies of Italy, and to have been founded jointly by the Euboean Chalcis and the Aeolian Cyme. In the *Aeneid* Aeneas is twice bidden to consult the Sibyl, once by Helenus (*Aen.* iii. 441-460), and again by Anchises (*Aen.* v. 730-736), while the Sixth Book gives us the story of the actual visit to the Sibyl's grotto. So Ovid speaks of the "Virgo Cumæa" (*Met.* xiv. 135), of the "Cumæae templa Sibyllae" (*Met.* xv. 712), of "Cumæos annos," referring to the longevity of the Sibyl (*Ex Ponto*, ii. 8. 41); so Valerius Flaccus of the "Cumæa vates" (i. 5), and Lucan of the "vates Cumana" (v. 183). I think, therefore, there can be little doubt that, in using the phrase "Cumæum carmen," Virgil refers to the Sibyl, not to Hesiod.



Postponing for the present the inquiry whether Virgil borrowed from Hesiod any part of his description of the golden age, we enter on the difficult question, What was the Sibylline song to which he here alludes as foretelling such an age, the world's crowning era of virtue and happiness? We can hardly suppose that it is the poet himself who is "rapt into future times" and utters his own visions under the mask of the Sibyl. More than any other of the great poets Virgil depends upon his predecessors. It would seem, therefore, that he must have had in his mind some distinct Sibylline utterance when he used the phrase "*Cumaeum carmen*."

The first thing which this phrase would suggest to any Roman would be the *Sibylline Books*, called also *Libri Fatales*, or simply *Libri*, which were believed to have been purchased by Tarquin and preserved with such care, first by the *Duumviri*, and finally by the *Quindecimviri*, until they were burnt in the conflagration of the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus in the Social War, B.C. 83. Constant references are made to these books in the pages of Livy. According to Dion. Hal. (*A. R.* iv. p. 792) they were consulted, upon the order of the Senate, in any serious trouble, whether of foreign war or civil discord, and also on the occurrence of any prodigy, to ascertain how the wrath of the gods was to be appeased. In accordance with this is Marquardt's statement (*Röm. Staatsverwaltung*, vol. iii. p. 43) that their purpose was not to reveal the future, but to provide counsel and help in calamities, where the ordinary rites were of no avail. These books came originally from the neighbourhood of Troas, and pointed to the help of gods who were either themselves foreign or to be worshipped after some foreign ritual. Their introduction, aided by the intercourse with the Greek colonies of southern Italy, brought into Rome the knowledge of various Graeco-

Asiatic deities ; and we are expressly told that the inauguration of the *Lectisternia* and *Supplicationes* was due to directions contained in the Sibylline Books (Liv. v. 13, vii. 27). As these books were only to be read by the official interpreters, the Quindecimviri,<sup>1</sup> upon the order of the Senate, and could not be promulgated, after being read, until the Senate had given their consent,<sup>2</sup> it is plain that very little could be known of their contents to the ordinary citizen beyond the ceremonial rules published from time to time, of which Livy gives so many examples<sup>3</sup> ; rules which have certainly very little in common with Virgil's prophecy of the golden age.

If we turn, however, to the original home of these oracles in Asia Minor, they appear in a very different light in the famous saying of the great Ephesian philosopher, Heraclitus, towards the end of the sixth century (i.e. about the time of the expulsion of the Roman kings). In Fragment xii. of Bywater's edition we read the striking words—Σίβυλλα δὲ μαινομένη στόματι ἀγέλαστα καὶ ἀκαλλώπιστα καὶ ἀμύριστα φθεγγόμενη χιλίων ἐτέων ἐξικνέεται τῇ φωνῇ διὰ τὸν θεόν, “the Sibyl with frenzied lips uttering things unmirthful, unadorned and unperfumed, reaches by her voice through a thousand years by the will of the god.”<sup>4</sup> Plato

<sup>1</sup> They seem to have had the assistance of two officials skilled in the use of the Greek language : see Alexandre, *Excursus ad Sibyllina*, vol. ii. p. 197.

<sup>2</sup> This is shown by the general disapproval of Cato's action, when, as tribune, he compelled the Quindecimviri, against the vote of the Senate, to publish the Sibylline oracle as to the restoration of King Ptolemy with an armed force : see Cicero's letters to Lentulus (*ad Fam.* i. 1, 2, 5) ; Dion. Cass. xxxix. 15.

<sup>3</sup> A synopsis of these is given by Alexandre, *l.c.* pp. 198 foll.

<sup>4</sup> The genitive is used with ἐξικνεῖσθαι by Xenophon, *Anab.* iii. 3, 7, οἱ ἀκοντισταὶ βραχύτερα ἡκόντιζον ἢ ὥς ἐξικνεῖσθαι τῶν σφενδονητῶν, “the range of the javelins was too short to reach the slingers.” In other passages the word is better translated “to hit,” “to cover.” The meaning of Heraclitus would thus be “covers with her voice a thousand years,” i.e., utters truth bearing on far distant ages. We may conjecture, how-

gives an equally lofty idea of the Sibyl in the *Phaedrus*, p. 244, where, after speaking of the many benefits public and private bestowed on man through the divine madness of the prophetess at Delphi and the priestess at Dodona, he adds that it would take long to tell of the good wrought by the Sibyl and others ὅσοι μαντικῇ χρώμενοι ἐνθέω πολλά δὴ πολλοῖς προλέγοντες ἐπὶ τὸ μέλλον ὥρθωσαν.

What do we gather from these, the most ancient testimonies to the fame of the Sibyl? <sup>1</sup> In the first place there is only one Sibyl. Later ages speak of four or ten, or even more, the number being increased partly through the rivalry of competing cities, partly perhaps through the influx of a new strain of prophecy, as in the case of the Jewish, the Babylonian and the Egyptian Sibyls. The inspiration, according to both authorities, is a literal possession, such as that of Cassandra and of the Cumæan Sibyl in the *Aeneid* (vi. 45-51, 77-80). The utterances themselves, according to Heraclitus, are limited to words of warning and of woe (ἀγέλαστα); they are harsh and uncouth, with no smooth flattering phrases (ἀκαλλώπιστα καὶ ἀμύριστα); they foretell the distant future; and Plato adds that their effect has been to bring about reform in nations and individuals. There seems to be a special significance in "the voice sounding on through a thousand years," for Ovid records the complaint of the Sibyl who has still to live three hundred years out of the destined thousand, during which she will continually dwindle away till nothing remains but a voice (*Met.* xiv. 143)—

Voce tamen noscar, vocem mihi fata relinquent.

Virgil, on the other hand, states that the oracles were usually

ever, from Ovid's "Cumæos annos" quoted above, as well as from other references, that some understood them as attributing long life to the Sibyl herself, "attains a thousand years."

<sup>1</sup> The Aristophanic parodies will come in for consideration later on.

written down on leaves,<sup>1</sup> which were liable to be scattered in disorder by the wind when the door of the cave was opened, and which, when once scattered, the Sibyl took no pains to rearrange. Hence those who apply to her for advice—

Inconsulti abeunt sedemque odere Sibyllæ.

For this reason Helenus warns Aeneas to implore the prophetess to utter the oracles with her lips, instead of writing them down (*Aen.* iii. 448–457). The disordered leaves were no doubt intended to signify the incoherence and the sudden transitions of the oracular books.

Far different from this is what Livy tells us of the *Libri Fatales*. It is of course possible that the oracles known to Heraclitus may have included ritual matters, which were of little interest to him, but which had a special charm for the prosaic Romans. It is also possible that the visions of the future, with their appalling pictures of divine vengeance, may have been too revolutionary for Roman conservatism; and the method of consulting them by the Quindecimviri may have been such as to leave large scope for the interpreters, like the *sortes* used in other Italian oracles.<sup>2</sup> But it is also quite possible that the Capitoline copy of the oracles may have differed from the Asiatic original both in the way of omission and addition.

Can we think of any class of writings which would agree better than the *Libri Fatales* (so far as we can con-

<sup>1</sup> See also Varro quoted by Servius on *Aen.* iii. 444.

<sup>2</sup> So Virgil, where he makes Aeneas promise the Sibyl that her oracles shall be held in high honour in Latium and be deposited in the temple of Apollo, uses the words (*Aen.* vi. 71)—

Te quoque magna manent regnis penetralia nostris :  
Hic ego namque tuas *sortes* arcanaque fata,  
Dicta meae genti, ponam, lectosque sacrabo,  
Alma, viros.

jecture their nature from the facts mentioned by Livy), with the hints dropped by Heraclitus? There are books dating from a hundred years before his time, which speak of another voice "crying in the wilderness." The prophets, of whom they tell us, profess to speak in the name of God and under His inspiration. The larger part of their prophecies consists of threats of judgment. They deal with the fate of nations and of individuals reaching on to the end of time. They are often confused, apparently self-contradictory, difficult to understand, mixed up of blessing and cursing in an inexplicable way. Yet they have been signally successful in bringing sinners to repentance, and in raising the moral standard both in nations and individuals. In one point they depart from the old type as described by Heraclitus. They appeal to hope as well as to fear; they hold out the prospect of a final reign of righteousness and peace. As to the style in which these books are written, in so far as the original Hebrew is concerned, they might be characterized in a good sense as ἀκαλλώπιστα καὶ ἀμύριστα; but, if we think of the later Greek translation, we should have to apply these words in the same depreciatory sense as that in which they seem to have been used by Heraclitus of the Sibylline verses current in his time.

The conquests of Alexander initiated a period of growing intercourse between Greeks and Jews. Before the end of the third century B.C. a large part of the Old Testament had been translated into Greek, and the Jews were beginning to interest themselves in the literature of Greece. In this literature nothing would be more likely to attract their attention than the Sibylline oracles, which, if we may judge from the earliest mention of them by Greek writers, had so many features in common with their own prophecies, and which offered them such a good opportunity of winning



fresh proselytes by surreptitiously introducing to the Gentiles the religious ideas of the Hebrews. This work had been already commenced in the second century B.C. by the insertion of longer or shorter sections of Jewish history or prophecy into the acknowledged oracles, to which whole books were subsequently added by Jewish, and then by Christian forgers. In the words of Schürer (Eng. tr. vol. iii. p. 276), "The collection as we have it is a chaotic wilderness. . . . Even the single books are some of them arbitrary aggregates of single fragments . . . Every reader and writer allowed himself to complete what existed after his own pleasure, and to arrange the scattered papers now in one, now in an opposite manner. Evidently much was at first circulated in detached portions, and the collection of these, afterwards made by some admirer, was a very accidental one. Hence duplicates of many portions are found in different places."

I return now to Rome and to the measures taken by the Roman Government to replace the *Libri Fatales* destroyed by fire in B.C. 83. After the rebuilding of the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus by Sulla, the Senate, in B.C. 76, at the instigation of the Consul, C. Curio, sent envoys to the different places which were supposed to possess collections of Sibylline writings, whether public or private; and, after careful sifting, about a thousand verses were deposited in the vaults of the restored temple.<sup>1</sup> It is evident from the writings of the time that there was a widespread interest in this search for oracles, and in the question of their authenticity, and we are told that

<sup>1</sup> A majoribus decretum erat post exustum sociali bello Capitolium, quaesitis Samo, Ilio, Erythris, per Africam etiam ac Siciliam et Italicas colonias carminibus Sibyllae, una seu plures fuere, datoque sacerdotibus negotio, quantum humana ope potuissent vera discernere (Tac. *Ann.* vi. 12); Lact. *Inst.* i. 6.

many spurious oracles were manufactured to further political intrigues. Thus Lentulus, the conspirator, in 63 B.C. affirmed,<sup>1</sup> "ex falsis sibyllinis haruspicumque responsis, se esse tertium illum Cornelium, ad quem regnum hujus urbis atque imperium venire esset necesse; Cinnam ante se et Sullam fuisse . . . fatalem hunc esse annum ad interitum hujus urbis atque imperii, qui esset decimus annus post Virginum absolutionem, post Capitolii autem incensionem vicesimus." Similarly the authority of the Sibyl was invoked in support of the proposal to give the title of king to Julius Caesar (Cic. *De Divin.* ii. 110). "Sibyllae versus observamus, quos illa furens fudisse dicitur; quorum interpretes nuper falsa quadam hominum fama dicturus in Senatu putabatur, eum quem re vera Regem habebamus, appellandum quoque Regem, si salvi esse vellemus. Hoc si est in libris, in quem hominem et in quod tempus est? Callide enim qui illa composuit perfecit, ut quodcunque accidisset praedictum videretur, hominum et temporum definitione sublata"; and a similar story is told by Suetonius (*Jul. Caesar*, 79): "Fama percrebuit . . . proximo senatu L. Cottam, quindecimvirum, sententiam dicturum, ut, quoniam libris fatalibus contineretur Parthos nisi a rege non posse vinci, Caesar rex appellaretur."

One method of distinguishing between true and false prophecies appears to have been the use of acrostics in the latter. Thus Cicero (*De Div.* ii. 111) argues that such an artificial form of composition is inconsistent with the divine frenzy ascribed to the Sibyl, and Varro is quoted to the same effect by Dion. Hal. (*A. R.* iv. 62), as saying that the spurious oracles may be detected by the so-called acrostics.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cic. *Cat.* iii. 9.

<sup>2</sup> Possibly the use of acrostics may be derived from the Jews, as something

The continued multiplication of books claiming to be oracular is further shown by the action of Augustus in the year 12 B.C., when he succeeded Lepidus as Pontifex Maximus, and called in all the unauthorized oracles, whether Greek or Latin, which were in circulation. Suetonius tells us<sup>1</sup> that he destroyed upwards of two thousand volumes, retaining only a selection of the Sibylline books, which he moved from the Capitol and deposited in the vaults of his new temple of the Palatine Apollo, thus fulfilling, as Servius says, the promise made by Aeneas to the Sibyl of Cumae (*Aen.* vi. 69 foll.). We learn from Dio Cassius (liv. 17) that he required even these, since they were getting illegible from age, to be replaced by new copies, made by the priests with their own hands, in order that no one else might read them. As the existing copies had been placed in the Capitol only about sixty years before, it seems probable that this was merely a pretext for the omission of any passages which might be thought dangerous. For the same reason Tiberius, when excitement was caused, in reference to the feud between Piso and Germanicus, by the supposed discovery of an ancient prophecy of the Sibyl, declaring that in thrice three hundred years Rome was doomed to perish by internal strife, ordered a re-inspection and fresh sifting of the oracular books, *καὶ τὰ μὲν ὡς οὐδενὸς ἄξια ἀπέκρινε, τὰ δὲ ἐνέκρινε* (Dio. Cass. lvii. 18).

I think we are now in a condition to answer with some confidence the question where Virgil found his "Cumaeum carmen." (1) It was evidently impossible for him to have any knowledge of the old Roman books which perished in 83 B.C. some years before his birth. (2) There is no ground

resembling it is found in some of the Psalms and in the Book of Lamentations. It occurs also in the Prologues to the Plautine Comedies, written about 50 B.C., and is said to have been used by Ennius. There is a famous example in *Orac. Sib.* viii. 217-250.

<sup>1</sup> Oct. 31.

for supposing that, in the year 40 B.C., when he wrote this Eclogue, he could have had any knowledge of the books which replaced them in the restored temple of Jupiter Capitolinus. We have seen how strict were the conditions under which the *Libri Fatales* might be inspected. Even the keepers were not allowed to consult them, far less to publish their oracles, without the express order of the Senate, and Justin (*Apol.* i. 44) states that those who read them (without permission, we may suppose) were liable to be put to death. (3) We have no reason for thinking that Virgil could have seen any collection of oracles preserved in Erythrae or elsewhere out of Italy; and at Cumae, the one place in Italy where one might expect to find such, we learn from Pausanias (x. 12) that there were none to be seen. (4) We are driven therefore to the conclusion that Virgil's "Cumaeum carmen" was one of those which, having been imported from Asia Minor about the year 76 B.C., had not been thought worthy of admission to the Capitol, but were apparently still in circulation in Rome at the time when the Eclogue was written. It is possible, nay it is probable, that this *carmen* was of Jewish origin. No other people had such strong reasons for composing such oracles; no others could make them so interesting; no others had such opportunities of pushing the sale of them as the ubiquitous Jew. We may even indulge the fancy that the interest which Virgil had shown in the Sibylline poems may have led to his being consulted by Augustus and Maecenas in the selection of Oracles for the Palatine temple, which was dedicated in 27 B.C. It is true that Augustus did not succeed to the office of Pontifex Maximus till the death of Lepidus in 12 B.C., seven years after the death of Virgil, but he had taken a leading part in the restoration of the national religion, as in the celebration of the Ludi Saeculares, ever since he

became supreme by the battle of Actium; and Virgil (as we have seen) was aware of his intention to transfer the Sibylline Books to the Palatine, when he wrote the sixth book of the *Aeneid*. Possibly the actual Jewish original of his Eclogue found a place in the new *Libri Fatales*.

It may be well to notice here Forbiger's objection (see his edition of Virg. vol. i. page 63) to the idea that a Roman poet could have condescended to borrow from a Jewish writing. "Quis vero scriptorum Latinorum superstitiones Judaicas, nisi illas deridere vellet, adsciscere vel tractare dignatus est?" In the first place, there is no reason to suppose that Virgil was aware of the Jewish origin of the Sibylline oracle which he follows. Doubtless it professed to come from Erythrae. In the next place the tender-hearted and widely sympathetic Virgil was just as little likely to share the hard Roman contempt for the Jew, as he was to share the bitter prejudice against Carthage. If he could take the Carthaginian Queen for his heroine, if in her story he dared to reverse the old idea of Roman and of Punic faith, why should we suppose him to be less sensitive than was Longinus afterwards to the sublimity of the sacred books of the Hebrews? Besides, we have plenty of evidence to show that, in this time of the breaking up of old faiths, the eastern religions exercised an extraordinary attraction in Rome.

Supposing, then, that such a vision as we have in the eleventh chapter of Isaiah had been taken as the subject of a Sibylline poem, are there any allusions in the fourth Eclogue which would correspond with and might be explained by this?

We will take first the general idea of a golden age still to come. So far as the Greeks or Romans knew or dreamt of a golden age, it belonged to the infancy of the world, corresponding to the Garden of Eden among the Hebrews.



Hesiod,<sup>1</sup> Aratus,<sup>2</sup> Ovid,<sup>3</sup> all start with this, descending to their own generation by a gradual decline from golden to silver, from silver to brazen, from brazen to iron, except that Hesiod interpolates an age of Heroes between the brazen and the iron. Still more plainly is this principle of degeneration expressed by Horace (*Carm.* iii. 6. 45)—

Damnosa quid non imminuit dies ?  
Aetas parentum pejor avis tulit  
Nos nequiores, mox daturos  
Progeniem vitiosiore;

and by Juvenal (xiii. 28)—

Nona aetas oritur peioraque saecula ferri  
Temporibus, quorum scelere non invenit ipsa  
Nomen et a nullo posuit natura metallo.

But may not this imagination of a golden age in the future be derived from the Stoic doctrine of the periodic renewal of the world, a *παλιγγενεσία* or *ἀποκατάστασις* at the end of the cosmic year, the *magnus annus* of Virgil ? This very phrase, as well as the belief in the recurrence of the past, described in the lines which follow—

Alter erit tum Tiphys et altera quae vehat Argo  
Delectos heroas ; erunt etiam altera bella,  
Atque iterum ad Troiam magnus mittetur Achilles,

leave no doubt that Virgil was familiar with the teaching of the Stoics on this point.

It is true that the “magnus annus” was originally an astronomical conception, not confined to the Stoics, but shared by all men of science. As the solar year was com-

<sup>1</sup> *Opera* 109.—Goettling thinks that Hesiod looked forward to an improvement after the iron age, because he utters the wish that he might either have died before it, or been born afterwards ; but there is nothing to support such an interpretation, and it is better to take the words as Paley does, as merely expressive of strong dislike—“better any age than this.” Paley even holds that vv. 180–201 are descriptive of a sixth and still more degenerate age.

<sup>2</sup> *Phaenomena*, 110 foll. Aratus omits the iron age.

<sup>3</sup> *Metam.* i. 89 foll.

plete when the sun returned to his original position in the heavens, so the "great year" was complete "cum ad idem, unde semel profecta sunt cuncta astra redierint, eandemque totius caeli discriptionem longis intervallis rettulerint, tum ille vere vertens annus appellari potest, in quo vix dicere audeo quam multa hominum saecula teneantur" (Cic. *De Republica*, vi. 22).<sup>1</sup> The Stoics connected this with their doctrine of the periodical conflagration of the universe, and also with their astrological views. Since the life of man was determined by the aspect and influence of the stars, when the stars returned to their original position, there must be a recurrence of human history.<sup>2</sup>

But though Virgil adds to his sketch of the golden age some colours from the Stoic natural philosophy, he says not a word of the most important part of it, viz. the universal conflagration which precedes the new world, and the hopeless outlook of predestined decline which follows. His view seems rather to be that there will be a gradual progress corresponding to the age of the child whose birth initiates the new era. This child is—

Cara deum soboles, magnum Jovis incrementum,

the offspring of the gods, the mighty embryo of a Jupiter. There is nothing parallel to this in Stoic teaching, but it might well be a paraphrase direct or indirect of Isaiah ix. 6, "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father"; and of Isaiah vii. 14, 16:

<sup>1</sup> See the passages quoted in my note on Cic. *N. D.* ii. 51, and Zeller, *Die Phil. d. Griechen*, vol. iv. p. 154.

<sup>2</sup> See Orig. *c. Cels.* v. 20: φασί δὲ οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Στοᾶς κατὰ περίοδον ἐκπύρωσιν τοῦ παντὸς γίνεσθαι, καὶ ἐξῆς αὐτῇ διακόσμησιν παντ' ἀπαράλλακτα ἔχουσιν ὡς πρὸς τὴν προτέραν διακόσμησιν . . . καὶ Σωκράτην μὲν πάλιν Σωφρονίσκου υἱὸν καὶ Ἀθηναίων ἔσεσθαι . . . καὶ Ἄνυτος δὲ καὶ Μέλητος ἀναστήσονται πάλιν Σωκράτους κατήγοροι. So Servius on *Ecl.* iv. 4: "Quod si est idem siderum motus, necesse est ut omnia quae fuerunt habeant iterationem. Universa enim ex astrorum motu pendere manifestum est."

“Therefore the Lord Himself shall give you a sign : behold, a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and thou shalt call his name Emmanuel . . . Before the child shall know to refuse the evil and choose the good, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings.”

We go on now to consider the other details of the new age depicted by Virgil, and, if possible, to find out where they are taken from. It is not necessary to fix on some one authority to the exclusion of all others, nor need we even expect to find perfect consistency. Virgil is a poet, writing at the most critical epoch of human history, with a heart and mind open to all influences ; and in this poem he embodies the half-conscious hopes and forebodings of his time. The Sibyl was never supposed to be logical, and Virgil here makes no attempt to reconcile the rival claims of Apollo, Saturnus and Jupiter, who are all named as presiding over the new age.

I take first the phrase “*ultima Cumaei carminis aetas.*” Servius, in his note on *Ecl.* ix. 47, quotes the Memoirs of Augustus to the effect that the soothsayer Vulcatius had interpreted the appearance of the comet at the funeral games held in honour of Caesar, as denoting the end of the ninth age and the beginning of the tenth. Plutarch (*Vita Sullae*, 7), speaking of the signs which foreboded the rise of Sulla, mentions in particular the piercing and terror-striking sound of a trumpet which came from a clear sky, and was understood to announce the end of the eighth stage of the great year. Censorinus (*De Die Natali*, 17) adds that the Etruscan soothsayers believed that, when the tenth stage was completed, there would be an end of the Etruscan name. Servius, in his note on this line, says that, according to the Sibyl, the last age is the tenth, the age of the Sun or Apollo. In the existing Sibylline books (e.g. iv. 20, 47, viii. 199) the tenth age is also mentioned as the

concluding age of the world's history. In the Old Testament the age of the Messiah has of course no number attached to it, but it is constantly spoken of as the "last time," as in Isaiah ii. 2.

l. 4. "*Iam redit et Virgo, redeunt Saturnia regna.*" There is no doubt that "Virgo" here is to be explained by *Geor.* ii. 474:

Extrema per illos  
Iustitia excedens terris vestigia fecit;

and by Seneca, *Octavia*, 423—

Astraea virgo siderum magnum decus.

Justice driven from earth by the wickedness of man was enshrined in heaven as the constellation Virgo. The story is borrowed from Aratus (*Phaen.* 96-136), which is itself expanded from Hesiod, *Op.* 200. It is not impossible, however, that Virgil may also have had in his mind the "virgin" of Jewish prophecy as concerned in the coming epoch. The happy reign of the Latin god Saturnus was commemorated in the Saturnalia, the festival of equality and peace. In later times he was identified with the Greek god Cronos, who was believed to have held supreme authority in the golden age (*Hes. Op.* 111) and also to have ruled over the dead Heroes in the Isles of the Blest (*ibid.* 169; Pindar, *Olymp.* ii. 123 foll.). Virgil combines the two in *Aen.* viii. 319—

Primus ab aethereo venit Saturnus Olympo  
Arma Jovis fugiens et regnis exul adeptis.

See also *Georg.* i. 125, ii. 536.

l. 7. "*Iam nova progenies caelo demittitur alto.*" We may compare with this and the tenth line the third and oldest book of the existing Sibylline oracles, l. 652—

καὶ τὸν ἀπ' ἡελίοιο Θεὸς πέμψει βασιλῆα  
ὃς πᾶσαν γαῖαν παύσει πολέμοιο κακοῖο.

It must be confessed, however, that the Sybil, like her predecessor of the sixth century, still prefers to dwell on the sadder side of life, ἀγέλαστα φθεγγομένη.

“*Tuus iam regnat Apollo.*” We have already seen that, according to the Sibyl, Apollo was to preside over the tenth age. Another feature of the golden age is the recovery of pristine innocence, denoted by the return of the virgin Astraea, and expressly declared in ll. 13, 14—

Te duce si qua manent sceleris vestigia nostri  
Irrita perpetua solvent formidine terras.

Hesiod does not actually mention the virtue of the first men, but it stands out by contrast with the corruption of their successors. On the other hand, in Jewish prophecy righteousness is the most prominent note of the final reign of blessedness. Virgil's meaning here is much the same as in *Georg.* i. 500, where he prays that the young Augustus may be permitted “*everso succurrere mundo . . . ubi fas versum atque nefas, tot bella per orbem, tam multae scelerum facies.*”

l. 15. “*Ille deum vitam accipiet divisque videbit Permixtos heroas,*” taken from Hesiod, *Op.* 112: ὥστε θεοὶ δ' ἔζων ἀκηδέα θυμὸν ἔχοντες, but also in accordance with Jewish belief, as recorded in Exodus xxix. 45; Leviticus xxvi. 11, 12.

ll. 18, 19. “*Nulla munuscula cultu tellus . . . fundet.*” So Hesiod, l. 117: καρπὸν δ' ἔφερε ζείδωρος ἄρουρα αὐτομάτη πολλόν τε καὶ ἄφθονον. The same idea is repeated in lines 29 and 30 and with far more grandeur in Isaiah xxxv. 1: “The wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad, and the desert shall rejoice and blossom as the rose,” ib. lv. 13: “Instead of the thorn shall come up the fir tree, and instead of the briar shall come up the myrtle tree.” Compare also *Sib. Orac.* ii. 314–325; iii. 743–759.

l. 22. “*Nec magnos metuent armenta leones.*” The same idea is repeated in *Ecl.* v. 60. There is no parallel in Hesiod, but in Isaiah xi. 6 we read, “The wolf shall dwell with the



lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid, and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together, and a little child shall lead them. . . . They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain," which is nearly reproduced in *Sib. Or.* iii. 787-794.

l. 24. "*Occidet et serpens et fallax herba veneni.*" This again is not Hesiodic, but resembles Isaiah xi. 8, "The sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the basilisk's den." In *Georg.* i. 129 the same thought recurs; after the dethronement of Saturn, Juppiter "*malum virus serpentibus addidit atris.*"

l. 27. "*Quae sit poteris cognoscere virtus,*" "when the child has learnt what virtue is"; compare Isaiah vii. 16, "Before the child shall know to refuse the evil and choose the good."

l. 30. *Durae quercus sudabunt roscida mella.* This is named among the rewards of the righteous in *Hes. Op.* 230, and in *Sib. Orac.* iii. 745.

ll. 31 foll. "*Pauca tamen suberunt priscae vestigia fraudis.*" In this and the following lines we have a curious feature of the new age. Navigation, agriculture, the life of towns, the arts of civilization generally are spoken of as marks of a falling away from that primæval perfection, the restoration of which is described as the hope of humanity. No scope seems to be left for human effort and skill. There is no more place for commerce, since "*omnis feret omnia tellus*"; the dyer's hand is idle, since wool of every colour is produced by nature. This is an elaboration of Hesiod, *Op.* 236—

θάλλουσιν δ' ἀγαθοῖσι διαμπερές· οὐδ' ἐπὶ νηῶν  
νίσσονται, καρπὸν δὲ φέρει ζεῖδωρος ἄρουρα.

We may also compare it with the "Sabbath rest" of Israel, the promised peace which is to mark the reign of the Messiah (Isa. ix. 7). There are, moreover, occasional suggestions to be found in Hebrew writings which denote a high esteem

for a life of Arcadian simplicity, such as the ascription of inventions to the fallen angels and to the descendants of Cain, and again the disappearance of the sea from the new heaven and earth.

l. 36. "*Iterum ad Trojam magnus mittetur Achilles.*" It has been shown above that this is taken from the Stoic doctrine of the ἀποκατάστασις. It may also have been suggested by Hesiod's interpolation of the Heroic age, with its battles and adventures, in his picture of the four world-ages, possibly also by Jewish pictures of the Millennium, which was to be followed by a fresh outbreak of the powers of evil; or it may merely reflect the sudden transitions from good to evil in the visions of Isaiah and the other prophets. The interruption to the triumph of good is in any case merely a passing phenomenon, whether we are intended to see in it the last struggle of evil, or a necessary part of the training of the Conqueror for the high office to which he is appointed by

Concordes stabili fatorum numine Parcae,  
a line which reads like a protest on the part of the poet against the sad never-ending round of which the Stoics dreamt.

ll. 50-52. "*Aspice, venturo laetantur ut omnia saeclo.*" A faint echo of such passages as Isaiah xlv. 23, "Sing, O ye heavens, for the Lord hath done it; shout, ye lower parts of the earth: break forth into singing, ye mountains, O forest and every tree therein: for the Lord hath redeemed Jacob, and will glorify Himself in Israel."

I think the above comparison between Virgil and Isaiah naturally leads us to the conclusion that the thoughts and expressions of the prophet must have somehow filtered through to the poet; and the poet's own confession leads us to the Sibyl as the actual organ or medium of communi-

cation reaching through 700 years. But such a view is not without its own difficulties. The Eclogue is much nearer to the original prophecy than to the subsequent paraphrase, so far as that is to be found in the still extant Sibylline Oracles. We must remember, however, that these extant oracles contain only an infinitesimal portion of the oracles existing in the time of Virgil. The great mass of our Sibylline books are of Christian origin, retaining no doubt something of the character of the older books, whether Jewish or Pagan: and we are probably justified in supposing that the existing books owe their preservation mainly to the preference of Judaistic Christians, who valued them as the voice of prophecy among the Gentiles, confirming the prophets of Israel by confuting the errors of polytheism and idolatry, and setting forth the terrible punishments in store for unbelievers. The bitterness engendered by persecution solaced itself by dwelling upon the still heavier woes stored up by righteous vengeance for the persecutors. This, I think, will account for the prevailing tone both of the Sibylline passages cited by the Fathers, and of the body of Sibylline writings which have come down to us. But the parallels which I have cited above show that the future happiness in store for the righteous was not left entirely unnoticed, and I think Virgil's Eclogue is a proof that he must have had before him, if not an actual translation from Isaiah, at least some closer paraphrase of Messianic prophecy than we now possess.

Another interesting question is how Heraclitus could have spoken so highly of the Sibylline oracles of his time. Judging from the parodies in Aristophanes,<sup>1</sup> as well as from what are regarded as the most ancient of the extant oracles,

<sup>1</sup> Aristoph. *Eq.* 61: ἄδει δὲ χρησμούς· ὁ δὲ γέρων σιβυλλίq. The oracles given in ll. 1015, 1030, 1037, etc., are generally ascribed to Bacis, but we may suppose them to represent the Sibylline type. See Alexandre, p. 140 foll.

we should hardly have thought they could have deserved the encomiums passed on them by him and by Plato.

It may help to explain this high appreciation, if we call to mind the words of Simmias in the *Phaedo*, p. 85 *d*, where, discussing the question of the immortality of the soul, he says it is man's duty to find the best and most irrefragable of human words, and trusting himself to this, as to a raft, to set forth on the hazardous voyage of life, unless it were possible to find a surer and less dangerous way on board a stronger vessel, some word of God (εἰ μὴ τις δύναιτο ἀσφαλέστερον καὶ ἀκινδυνότερον ἐπὶ βεβαιότερου ὀχήματος, λόγου θείου τινός, διαπορευθῆναι). So, at a later period, Porphyry justified the publication of his treatise on the "Philosophy to be derived from Oracles," on the ground that the use of such a collection of the divine responses would be understood by all who had felt the painful craving after truth, and had sometimes wished that, by receiving the manifestation of it from the gods, they might be relieved from their doubts by information, not to be disputed (ὅσοι περὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ὠδίναντες ἤϋξαντό ποτε τῆς ἐκ θεῶν ἐπιφανείας τυχόντες ἀνάπανσιν λαβεῖν τῆς ἀπορίας διὰ τὴν τῶν λεγόντων ἐξιόπιστον διδασκαλίαν.)<sup>1</sup> If we suppose something of this feeling in Heraclitus and Virgil it would make it easier to understand the interest they took in the Sybilline Oracles.

On the other hand, nothing could be more appropriate than the words of the Ephesian philosopher, if they were meant to describe, say, the prophecies of Balaam, or the first five chapters, or any of the "Burdens" of Isaiah. Can we conceive any way in which these could have come to the knowledge of an Ephesian of 510 B.C.? We know that Psammetichus had encouraged the residence of Ionians in Egypt and surrounded himself with a body-

<sup>1</sup> Euseb. *Praep. Evang.* iv. 7.

guard of Greeks, about the middle of the seventh century. He and his successors, Necho and Psammuthis, were engaged in wars in Syria and Palestine, and we read of Jewish settlements being established in Egypt during their reigns (Jer. xlv. 1). Amasis (B.C. 569-525) was even a warmer philhellene than his predecessors, and received the honour of a visit from Solon. It was perfectly possible, therefore, for Greeks and Jews to fraternize in Egypt, and a native of Ephesus might thus bring back with him from Egypt some knowledge of Jewish prophecy, or a Greek soldier might get hold of some sacred scroll in an invasion of Judaea. Possibly future exploration in the tombs of Egypt may supply definite information on these points.

But granting this possibility, how are we to explain the use of the name Σίβυλλα in connexion with Jewish prophecy? Perhaps the note of Servius on *Aen.* iii. 445 may help us here. Discussing the etymology of the word, he says, "Aeoli σίους dicunt deos; βουλὴ autem est sententia: ergo Σιβύλλας quasi σίου (θεοῦ) βουλὰς dixerunt"; see Alexandre, pp. 1, 2, where this etymology is accepted and defended. If the word σίβυλλα meant originally the "counsel or will of God," we can see how it might be used for the utterance not only of the Greek prophetess, but also of the Jewish prophet declaring that will.

PS.—To those who desire further information on this abstruse and interesting subject I would especially recommend Alexandre's exhaustive *Excursus ad Sibyllina*, containing 624 pages (unfortunately without an index), which constitutes the second volume of his first edition of the *Oracula*; and next to that, Klausen's *Aeneas und die Penaten*, pp. 203-312; Marquardt's *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, vol. iii. pp. 42-54 and 366-344; Schürer's *History*



of the Jewish People, div. ii. vol. iii. pp. 270–292, containing a full bibliography ; and Bouché-Leclercq, *Histoire de la Divination*, vol. ii. 93–199. It may be worth while to compare the old edition of the Sibylline Books by Gallæus (A.D. 1689) which is followed by an Appendix containing a collection of other ancient Oracles by Opsopœus.

J. B. MAYOR.

### THE TESTIMONY OF ST. JOHN TO THE VIRGIN BIRTH OF OUR LORD.

IN recent discussions on the Virginal Birth of our Lord it has been felt to be a difficulty that there is no direct mention of it in the Fourth Gospel. The silence of St. John on this momentous point has been admitted as an undoubted fact both by those who accept in their literal sense the accounts of the nativity in St. Matthew and St. Luke, and by those who reject or explain away these accounts. Bishop Harvey Goodwin, for instance, goes so far as to say : “ Here also (in St. John’s Gospel) the birth into the world is simply and absolutely omitted,” meaning of course that there is no circumstantial account of it ; for he proceeds to say : “ As a matter of fact, the birth is omitted altogether, as has been already noticed ; but can it be seriously maintained that the omission in any way prejudices the truth of the miraculous story ? ” <sup>1</sup> And in a recent work on the Fourth Gospel <sup>2</sup> the author argues that the tradition of the Virgin Birth must have been known to St. John, but that he deliberately passed it over for reasons which the author proceeds to state. It appears, however, to the present writer that a deeper examination of the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel will demonstrate that although St. John gives no

<sup>1</sup> *The Foundations of the Creed*, p. 104.

<sup>2</sup> *The Fourth Gospel, its Purpose and Theology*, by Ernest F. Scott.

historical and circumstantial record of the Virgin Birth, his language carries the conviction that he accepted the truth of it; and that he practically re-states and re-affirms the narratives of the earlier Gospels.

Two preliminary points must be borne in mind : (1) First that the Prologue was addressed to readers already familiar with the witness of St. Matthew and St. Luke, and that therefore it was not necessary to repeat circumstantially the story of Nazareth and Bethlehem ; (2) secondly that St. John approaches the truth of the Incarnation from the divine side. A narrative of the Birth as an event in human history such as we have in the Synoptic Gospels would be alien to the purpose and style of the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel. But an allusion to that momentous fact as a point in the divine history of the manifestation of the Word is precisely what might have been expected of St. John. This is what we find ; and the following remarks are directed to discover the significance of the allusion.

The words in which St. John conveys the fact of the Incarnation are contained in the fourteenth and eighteenth verses of the first chapter of his Gospel. They are thus rendered in the Revised Version : 14, " And the Word became (*ἐγένετο*) flesh, and dwelt among us (and we beheld His glory, glory as of the only begotten (*μονογενοῦς*) from the Father), full of grace and truth . . . 18, No man hath seen God at any time, the only begotten Son (*marg.* many very ancient authorities read *God only begotten*), which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him."

As the present argument is concerned only with St. John's testimony to the Virgin Birth, deeply interesting points in this passage which are irrelevant to the argument will be passed over. What is important to notice is that the expressions used here refer to the moment and to the effects of the Incarnation and to the incarnate Christ, whose pre-

existence and equality with God have been described in the preceding verses. It is the neglect of this point that has impaired the value of the Johannine testimony to the Virgin Birth.

This restriction to the moment of the Incarnation is marked by the use of the word ἐγένετο ("became" R.V.; "was made" A.V.). It is a term that could not be applied to the pre-existent Word. It could not be said of the Word that He "became" or "was made" in the beginning. It is suggestive, of course, of a new genesis or creation. Indeed the whole chapter is a "Book of Genesis,"<sup>1</sup> that is, of the new Creation in contrast to and in co-ordination with the first Creation.

It is further to be noted that in the historic accounts of the Incarnation γίγνεσθαι or its cognate γεννᾶσθαι is the term used. In Luke i. 35 we read: "That which is to be born (τὸ γεννώμενον) shall be called holy, the Son of God"; in Matthew i. 20: "That which is conceived in her (τὸ ἐν αὐτῇ γεννηθέν) is of the Holy Ghost." Compare with these passages Philippians ii. 7, "being made (γενόμενος) in the likeness of men"; Galatians iv. 4, "God sent forth His Son born (γενόμενον) of a woman."

The evidence from the primitive creeds is to the same effect. In the third creed of St. Irenaeus the truth of the Incarnation is expressed: ἄνθρωπος ἐγένετο ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ; and in the first form of the Nicene Creed: τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς μονογενῆ.<sup>2</sup>

From these examples it seems to be a certain deduction that the important compound form ὁμογενής is also to be referred to the birth in time of the eternal Son of God.

The expression "the Word was created flesh" is one

<sup>1</sup> The verb γίγνεσθαι occurs twelve times in this chapter, in addition to the twice-repeated μονογενής.

<sup>2</sup> See Lumby, *History of the Creeds*, pp. 43, 50.

which suggests an event absolutely different from ordinary human generation. It is inconceivable that an ordinary human birth could be so described. The words which follow confirm this impression : " We beheld His glory, glory as of the only begotten of the Father." We dismiss the marginal version, (1) as conveying no intelligible meaning. For why should glory be ascribed in a special sense to an only begotten son of an (earthly) father ? And (2) as an inadequate translation of what was doubtless a Christian formula of the Christ the Son of God.

St. John then takes care to explain that the glory which he and the other Apostles witnessed was a " glory of the only begotten of the Father "—an expression not only perfectly consistent with belief in the Virgin Birth and in the Divine generation of Christ, but plainly indicating it. If the thought of an earthly father had entered into the Evangelist's mind, this would have been the moment to declare it. But he describes a wholly exceptional beginning of life—a creation of the second Adam by the act of God corresponding to the creation of the first Adam. Once more God " made man in His own image."

The remarkable variant from the received text in verse 18 is now to be considered. In place of " the only begotten Son (*ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός*) which is in the bosom of the Father," many very ancient authorities, as stated in the margin of R.V., read, " God only begotten " (*μονογενὴς θεός*). Among these very ancient authorities are the Sinaitic *Σ*, Vatican *B*, and Alexandrian *A* codices, belonging to the fourth and fifth centuries. The reading is adopted by Tregelles and by Westcott and Hort. Certainly the substitution of the somewhat startling phrase " God only begotten " for the more usual expression " the only begotten Son " is far less probable than the reverse change. As Westcott and Hort remark, " both readings intrinsically

are free from objection." For the purposes of this article we accept the reading, based on exceptionally strong evidence and adopted by these eminent editors. "The text, though startling at first," Westcott and Hort remark, "simply combines in a single phrase the two attributes of the *Logos* marked before (*θεός* v. 1, *μονογενής* v. 14). Its sense is, One who is both *θεός* and *μονογενής*." <sup>1</sup>

We have already seen that verse 14 describes a point in the revelation of the Word who is God, when "He took flesh," an expression inapplicable to ordinary human birth, and that the description of the glory of the incarnate *Logos* as "glory of the only begotten of the Father" bears witness to the unique generation of Christ. We have also seen that the term *μονογενής* (only born) refers not to the pre-existent Christ, but to the incarnate Christ. This point is so important that it may be well to refer to other passages where this word, confined in its use to St. John, occurs. These are, in the Gospel, chapter iii. vv. 16 and 18, and in the First Epistle, chapter iv. 9. In the first and last of these passages the order of words is τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, "His Son, His only Son," thus distinguishing, as in this passage, the pre-existent from the incarnate Son of God.

It now remains to consider the significance of the expressions in these texts in regard to the definite fact of our Lord's Nativity. And here it is contended that the term *μονογενής* (only born) placed in close connexion with *θεός* (God) excludes the supposition of a human father. The word signifies "unique in generation," and therefore that our Lord was the One only begotten Son of the Father in that special sense which is exclusive of human paternity. This, we maintain, can be deduced from the words used by St. John independently of the Synoptic evidence of the Virgin Birth. But if for the sake of argument we accept the

<sup>1</sup> Westcott and Hort, *The N. T. in Greek*, vol. ii. p. 74.



Synoptic evidence, how intelligible the Johannine expressions are seen to be !

From this point of view the expressions used by St. John are in fact not only a confirmation, but a re-statement in all their particulars of the Synoptic accounts of the Virgin Birth. For the significance of a statement must be judged in reference to those to whom it was first made. And to readers acquainted with the fact of the Virginal Birth of Christ the expression "God only begotten" or "unique in generation" would convey a distinct meaning. A single phrase sometimes introduces a flood of recollection, and is in itself equivalent to a long chain of reasoning or to a whole chapter of national history, as when a judge concurs in the argued decision of a brother judge, or as when a poet or an orator recalls a famous passage in history or romance to his readers or listeners.

Thus for those who can place themselves mentally in the position of St. John's first readers this testimony by allusion is proof of a more convincing character, and much more unmistakably genuine than proof conveyed in a narrative. It not only amounts to a restatement of facts, but implies universal acceptance in the Church of the truth of the Virgin Birth of our Lord.

ARTHUR CARR.

## THE DEMONOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

### INTRODUCTION.

THE subject of Demonology is one upon which a great deal has been written, and the special department of the subject known as Gospel Demonology, with the very difficult questions which it raises, has exercised the minds of many able writers ; but it may well be questioned whether the Demonology of the *Old Testament* has received the full attention that it deserves. The matter is dismissed with a somewhat

brief reference in our great Bible Dictionaries, and in a series of articles on the general subject, which are otherwise second to none in their wide grasp of details and masterly treatment of the subject, by Mr. F. C. Conybeare in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*,<sup>1</sup> the writer, in referring to that section which it is now proposed to deal with, makes a statement which the facts do not seem to justify; he says: "It is singular that the Old Testament is free from Demonology, hardly containing more than one or two examples thereof." If this should actually [prove to be the case, it would be not only singular, but simply incomprehensible. While willingly granting that the actual, direct references to the different categories of demons in the Old Testament are far fewer than one would expect, being perhaps not more than forty to fifty in number, the *indirect* references which testify to the popular belief seem to be very considerable.

It is not proposed to deal here with the subject fully, that would, one feels, require a regular treatise; what we hope to attempt is to *illustrate* it by a few examples. The present article will be occupied with a brief Introduction to the subject; two subsequent articles will deal respectively with "Demonology as illustrated in the prophetical writings," and "Demonology as illustrated by the ninety-first psalm."

As regards *Literature*, we shall confine ourselves to the mention of a few standard works from which details have been gathered for the purpose of illustrating the views here set forth. As references to these works will be frequent, abbreviations are used, as indicated in brackets below.

Morris Jastrow, jun., *Die Religion Babylonians und Assyriens*, Giessen, 1902 (Jastrow).

A. Jeremias, *Das alte Testament im Lichte des alten Orients*, Leipzig, 1904 (Jeremias).

<sup>1</sup> Vols. viii. ix. (1896, 1897).

O. Weber, *Dämonenbeschwörung bei den Babyloniern und Assyriern*, in "Der alte Orient," vii. 4. Leipzig, 1906. (OW.)

O. Weber, *Die Literatur der Babylonier und Assyrier*, Leipzig, 1907 (OWlit.).

J. Wellhausen, *Reste Arabischen Heidenthums*, Berlin, 1897 (Wellh.).

W. Robertson Smith, *The Religion of the Semites*, London, 1894 (RS.).

P. M. Lagrange, *Études sur les religions Sémitiques*, Paris, 1903 (Lagrange).

F. Weber, *Jüdische Theologie auf Grund des Talmud und verwandter Schriften*, Leipzig, 1897 (FW.).

W. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judenthums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*, Berlin, 1903 (Bousset).

B. Stade, *Biblische Theologie des alten Testaments*, I. Tübingen, 1905 (Stade).

## I.

There are certain considerations of a general character which show that one would naturally *expect* to find a system of Demonology in the Old Testament.

1. The belief in harmful (this is chronologically a more correct term than "evil") spirits is characteristic of a certain stage in the evolution of the religious beliefs of every race of men. It is so ineradicable an element in popular superstition that even among the most civilized nations of the present day there are numerous practices which testify to the universal belief in the activity of demons which existed even within quite recent times.<sup>1</sup> That Demonology is the necessary concomitant of Animism must be obvious to every student of Anthropology; and that there are many indications in the Old Testament of the remains of animistic conceptions is incontrovertible; one has but to recall the frequent allusions to holy trees, holy wells and holy stones, one has but to remember the original significance of such words as Elohim, Baal, Bethel, Nabi, etc., to realize at once that Animism and Polydaemonism were once as much at home in Syria (as they are indeed to a great extent at the

<sup>1</sup> It is well known that such beliefs are prevalent in the country districts of most, if not all, European countries even at the present day.

present time) as everywhere else.<sup>1</sup> And therefore one might reasonably expect to find traces of a more or less developed Demonology in the Old Testament.

2. Among those nations which are, racially, closely connected with the Israelites we find a very extended belief in demons. The Canaanites at the time of the Israelite invasion were in the stage of Polydaemonism ; they practised ancestor-worship and venerated the ancient tribal heroes at their traditional tombs, as well as under holy trees and beside holy wells.<sup>2</sup> Like other Semites they recognized the activity of a spirit, sometimes kindly disposed, at other times harmful (corresponding roughly to the later good and evil spirits,—angels and demons), in the storm, in the desert, in the tree, well and stone, in the heat of summer and cold of winter, in the clouds and stars, as well as in animals. They did not make the same clear distinction between gods, demons, men and animals that is characteristic of later and more civilized communities ; in a word, Polydaemonism, but not as yet Polytheism, was in vogue.<sup>3</sup> In the same way the Phœnicians, though owing to special causes they had attained a far higher civilization than the other Canaanite nations, practised a religion which had a like origin, a religion which, like that of the Canaanites, was developed from conceptions of a primitive character, and whose content was most probably very similar to that which the early Arabs practised.<sup>4</sup> The belief of the Arabs concerning demons is, however, more significant, for the great Arabian peninsula was the primeval home of the Semitic race,<sup>5</sup> and Arab belief and practice,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Stade, 98, 114 ff.

<sup>2</sup> RS. 168, 172.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Stade, 48 ff. ; A. v. Gall, *Altisraelitische Kultstätten*, passim (Giessen, 1898).

<sup>4</sup> Pietschmann, *Geschichte der Phönizier*, 155 ff. (Berlin, 1889) ; W. v. Landau, *Die Phönizier*, pp. 5 ff. (in "Der alte Orient," ii. 4, Leipzig, 1901).

<sup>5</sup> O. Weber, *Arabien vor dem Islam*, pp. 2 ff. (in "Der alte Orient," iii. 1).

even as found at the present day, go back to a hoary antiquity ; Mohammedanism scarcely affected the popular superstitions concerning the *Ginn* at all.<sup>1</sup> Lastly, the demonology of the Babylonians and Assyrians was of a very elaborate and important character, and owing to the immense influence which Babylonian thought and practice had both upon the ancient Israelites as well as upon the Jews of the post-exilic period, Babylonian demonology is of the greatest importance in connexion with our present investigation. So that, secondly, the fact that an elaborate system of demonology existed among the Canaanites, the Arabs and the Babylonians, all closely connected, racially, with the Israelites, raises the natural presumption that these latter, too, had a like system, and that we should therefore expect to find traces of it in their literature.

3. Then, again, in the Judaism of post-biblical times we find a system of demonology which is simply colossal.<sup>2</sup> One would reasonably suppose that this had its roots in the beliefs of earlier times within the nation itself ; but it is usually objected that the demonology of later Judaism is really the product of Babylonian, Persian, and Greek influence. Nobody can for a moment doubt that these influences have been very strong, and that Jewish demonology owes much to them, but the question is whether *all* (Babylonian, Persian, Greek and Jewish) do not trace their beliefs on this subject back to a common, very early source, of which the ancestors of all these nations possessed a common stock, varying of course in details, but identical in fundamentals ? It seems difficult to doubt this in view of what we know of the religion of ancient Phœnicia and of the Canaanites generally, and more especially in view of what

<sup>1</sup> It only propounded a new theory as to the origin of demons, in that it was taught that the gods of the heathen were demons.

<sup>2</sup> FW. 251 ff. ; Bousset, 331 ff.



we know of Arab demonology. While, as we shall see, there is great similarity in the details of all these systems, there is sufficient difference in those of Babylonians, Arabs and Jews to admit of a certain amount of matter proper to each, sufficient individuality in each of the three systems to warrant exclusive proprietorship. If this is so, if the demonology of later Judaism can lay claim to a character of its own, then there is at least a justification (of course it does not amount to proof) for believing that it is based in part upon earlier teaching, and that signs of this ought to be found in the Old Testament.

We have approached the subject so far with our eyes entirely turned away from the Old Testament, having regard only to what external facts might lead one to expect in reference to the presence or otherwise of a system of demonology in the Old Testament. In *turning* to the Old Testament our first feeling is one of surprise that apparently there is so little of such a system to be found; further study, however, reveals the fact that the absence of references to demons is not so great as appears at first sight; one becomes convinced, on the contrary, that many things which upon the surface seem to have nothing to do with the subject, do as a matter of fact bear witness to its wide prevalence among the people; words and phrases, which for the people of the time bore an obvious reference to popular beliefs concerning demons, have for us lost much or all of their significance, and it is only by the comparative method that their real meaning, for those to whom they were addressed, can be revealed.

It is willingly conceded that the number of references to the subject is not nearly so great as one would expect this is most likely to be accounted for by the fact that the teachers of Israel conceived that any power which was ascribed to demons might tend to detract from the single and

unique might of Jahwe; the practices and beliefs of the surrounding nations afforded ample proof that demonology was a danger to Monotheism. The prophets themselves believed in the activity of demons; the problem was how to safeguard monotheistic conceptions in presence of the, to them, undoubted existence of demons. The procedure was, as far as we can gather, a two-fold one; to some extent, though it is impossible to say to how great an extent, passages in the Old Testament writings in which a reference to demons seemed to be a danger to pure Jahwe-worship were altered, in some instances this process may be seen at work, Genesis xiv. 3, 8, 10, e.g., where עֵמֶק הַשְּׂדִים should in all probability be pointed עַ' הַשְּׂדִים, "the valley of the Shēdim" = "evil spirits" (see on these further below);<sup>1</sup> the LXX, instead of transliterating the proper name Siddim, uses the adjective ἀλυκή; that there was some doubt as to what the word really meant is seen from the fact that the Samaritan, Aquila and the Targum of Onkelos all differ from the Hebrew and the Greek, and read עַ' הַשְּׂדִים, "the valley of the fields," a rendering which (*pace* Dillmann)<sup>2</sup> does not seem to commend itself in view of verse 10, which tells us that "the vale of Siddim was full of slime pits." Again, in Hosea xii. 12 (E.V. 11) בִּגְלִיל שְׂדֵים זִבְחוֹ should assuredly be בִּגְלִיל לְשְׂדֵים זִ',<sup>3</sup> "in Gilgal they sacrifice to the demons";<sup>4</sup> the LXX reads Γαλαὰδ ἄρχοντες (= שְׂדֵים) θυσιάζοντες; in the Hebrew, שְׂדֵי at the end of the verse might well have been a word-play. A somewhat similar emendation of the original text is found in 2 Kings xxiii. 8; . . . וְנָתַץ אֶת-בְּמוֹת הַשְּׂעִרִים.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Stade, 189.

<sup>2</sup> *Die Genesis*, p. 234 (Leipzig, 1886).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Nowack, *Die Kleinen Propheten*, p. 76 (Göttingen, 1897).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Deut. xxxii. 17, יִזְבְּחוּ לְשְׂדֵים; the same phrase is found in Ps. cvi.

("And brake down the high places of the gates") does not give good sense, the suggested form of what was originally written בְּמַת הַשְּׁעָרִים ("the high-place, or sanctuary, of the desert-demons" [lit. he-goats])<sup>1</sup> gives perfect sense and accords far better with the context (on שְׁעָרִים see below); this worship is prohibited in Leviticus xvii. 7, "And they shall no more sacrifice their sacrifices unto the he-goats" (שְׁעָרִים).

In the second place, actions which most likely were originally ascribed to demons working independently were explained, on the one hand, as showing that all spirits, whether good or bad, were but the agents of Jahwe, on the other, that there was no intermediary and that Jahwe Himself acted directly. It is only on some such supposition that one can understand a passage like 1 Samuel xvi. 14 יִבְעֵתָהּ רוּחַ-רָעָה מֵאֵת יְהוָה: ("And an evil spirit from Jahwe troubled him"); the word בְּעֵת clearly shows that the evil spirit (πνεῦμα πονηρόν as it is called in the LXX here, precisely as in the Gospels) is really to be differentiated from Jahwe in its action, for it is an intensive form meaning to "make afraid," "inspire terror"; it is not Jahwe who does this but the evil spirit; the words מֵאֵת יְהוָה would, one feels, be better away, and were probably not there originally. Or again, to illustrate this further, according to Exodus xi. 4 ff., xii. 23a, it is Jahwe Himself who slays the firstborn in Egypt, while in xii. 23b it is the "destroyer" who is to do this; in Numbers xxii. 22 ff., it is at one time Jahwe, at another His "messenger" who threatens Balaam.<sup>2</sup> It may be stated as not improbable that the evolution of thought passed through the following stages: an original animistic stage, in which some spirits were harmful, others

<sup>1</sup> See Kittel's edition (*Biblia Hebraica*) in loc. Cf. Stade, 188.

<sup>2</sup> See Stade, 98 ff.

more kindly disposed ; then followed the introduction of Jahwe-worship, in which Jahwe was originally *primus inter pares*, and finally issued as supreme ; hereupon came a stage in which it became difficult to decide in how far it was consonant with the dignity of Jahwe to believe Him personally active among His people, and in how far it was permissible to countenance the belief in intermediary agents ; for the danger would always exist in this stage of these latter becoming objects of worship ; last of all came the stage in which the sole worship of Jahwe—Monotheism—had become so firmly established that there was little danger of His having any real rival, so that the popular belief in demons might now go on unchecked. To be sure, these stages can never have been definitely marked off from each other, one must have run into another, so that the inconsequent statements which we find on the subject in the Old Testament are the most natural thing in the world, and precisely what we should expect to find ; and the text-adaptations referred to above were demanded by the different conceptions which were characteristic of these stages, and therefore perfectly legitimate. But this would account to a great extent for the, comparatively speaking, few *direct* references to demons, though the actual number we believe to be far greater than is usually supposed.

It was stated just now that it was only by the comparative method that the real meaning of many passages, i.e. a reference to demons, could be revealed ; as both, our examination of passages from the prophetic writings, as well of the ninety-first psalm, will be illustrated by Arab and Babylonian demonology, as well as by that of later Judaism, here will be the place to give a brief *résumé* of some of the many points common to all three ; and this will go far towards offering an *a priori* presumption that an Old Testament system of demonology exists. For the Arab beliefs go, confessedly,

back to a very hoary antiquity, to a time when the common stock of Semitic demonology was the property of a race which had not yet been so widely dispersed as when it appears upon the horizon of history. Babylonian demonology, again, while inheriting the common stock, developed conceptions of a special character which exercised a strong influence upon early Israel as well as upon the post-exilic Jews. Later Judaism, finally, while owing much to external, must surely reflect, as well, elements which must have been national property for many centuries. If then we find elements of a specific character common to these three systems of demonology, systems which existed respectively before, during and after the biblical period, the presumption will be very strong that a demonology should also exist in the Old Testament, could we but uncover it.

## II.

We proceed now to indicate certain beliefs concerning demons which are common to Arab, Babylonian and Jewish demonology.

(a) All three systems insist on the immense numbers of demons that exist in the world. The Arabic term *Ginn* is a collective word; the singular *Gânn* is a derivative from this.<sup>1</sup> Among the Babylonians the large number of proper names for demons points to their multiplicity; in one text it is said that the demons cover the whole world, in another that "they cover the earth like grass."<sup>2</sup> The Rabbis taught that the demons gather themselves together in companies (*Berachoth* 51a); according to *Tanchuma Mishpatim* 19 the whole world is full of these "harmful spirits" ("Mazikin"); the number is given by one Rabbi as seven and a half millions, and elsewhere it is stated that every man has

<sup>1</sup> Wellh. 148, 149.

<sup>2</sup> Jastrow, 355, 357; OWlit. 148.



ten thousand of them at his right hand, and a thousand at his left.<sup>1</sup>

(b) According to Arab teaching the *Ginn* are the ghostly shadows of nations that have perished; certain ruined sites, such as Higr and Niçibin, were pointed out as being inhabited by the spirits of those who in days gone by lived there. All burial-places were believed to be full of demons.<sup>2</sup> This connexion between the demons and the spirits of the departed is likewise a strongly marked characteristic in Babylonian belief; here it was taught, for example, that the demons were the messengers of Ereshkigal, queen of the realm of the dead; Namtaru, one of the worst demons, issued, it was said, from the nether-world; Utukku, "who harms those who dwell in the wilderness," is also a spirit of the dead; and closely connected with him is Ekimmu, "the departed soul," who for some reason or other can find no rest, and wanders over the earth injuring men whenever opportunity offers; his anger is especially directed against those with whom he has had any relations while on earth, and it is supposed to be partly their fault that he is unable to re-enter the realm of the dead and find rest.<sup>3</sup> If, for any reason, the spirits of the departed were unable to enter the realm of the dead, they had to wander about the earth until the hindrance was taken away; while thus banished from their rightful abode they made it their business to harm all those with whom they had had any connexions while on earth, especially relatives; for, according to Babylonian ideas, it was owing to the neglect of those who were left that the departed spirits were unable to get to rest. Ekimmu would thus appear to have been regarded as a kind of champion or leader of these. It is not clear what, precisely,

<sup>1</sup> FW. 254 ff.; cf. Mk. v. 9, Luke viii. 30. See the writer's art. on "Demons" in Hastings' *Dict. of Christ and the Gospels*.

<sup>2</sup> Wellh. 150.

<sup>3</sup> OWlit. 148, 167.

were the causes which hindered the departed from entering into rest ; but among them must certainly have been neglect of the prescribed burial rites, more especially when a body remained unburied, or lay in foreign soil ; neglect to bring the proper offerings for the dead would also, doubtless, have been considered another cause of the restlessness of departed spirits. That Jewish teaching regarding the connexion between the departed and demons ran on the same lines is clear from the fact that the head of the demons, Sammael (identical with Satan) was known as the " Angel of death." <sup>1</sup> Among the Jews, too, cemeteries were one of the favourite spots in which demons congregated.<sup>2</sup> It is, moreover, possible that a faint echo of this connexion is to be seen in the drinking of the cup of mourners in modern synagogues ; that this is the remnant of some ancient custom concerning offerings for the dead can scarcely be doubted.<sup>3</sup>

(c) All sickness is due to demons ; thus the Arabs taught that fainting fits, epilepsy, gout, fever, epidemics of every kind, and above all madness, were every one of them the result of the harmful activity of evil-disposed demons.<sup>4</sup> The same is found in the Babylonian and Jewish systems ; thus, among the Babylonians there was a demon of headache, Labartu and Namtaru were pest-demons, and there were many storm-demons by whom men were harmed <sup>5</sup> ; Ashakku was the demon of burning fever, and Dimetum was " the evil curse." <sup>6</sup> Among the Jews Shabiri was the demon who brought blindness, while there was another demon of leprosy, another of heart-disease, another of fever, and there was also the storm-demon.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> FW. 253.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Luke. viii. 27, etc.

<sup>3</sup> For the connexion between demons and departed spirits see *Bk. of Jubilees*, xxii. 17 ; *Syb. Orac.*, Proem. 20-22. (Ed. Kautsch ; Tübingen, 1900) ; cf. also Targum of Onkelos, Lev. xvii. 7.

<sup>4</sup> Wellh. 155.

<sup>5</sup> Jastrow, 350.

<sup>6</sup> OWLit. 148, 165.

<sup>7</sup> Bousset, 334.

(d) All three systems agree that at night the power of demons is greatest ; for this reason the Arabs covered the children's faces at night-time,—presumably this was to avert the evil eye,—every vessel was covered over, lights were lit, and the doors were locked. It was only at the rising of the morning star that the demons dispersed. Among the Babylonians we read that Alu wanders about at nights ; he is to be found in ruins, where he hides, waiting to fall upon any luckless passer-by ; he creeps into bedrooms and robs the weary of their sleep ; he is described as running about at nights “like a dog.”<sup>1</sup> In the same way, the demon Gallu sweeps through the streets after dark making every place insecure.<sup>2</sup> So, too, in the Jewish system it is taught that demons are most harmful from dusk until cock-crowing ; at nights they surround houses and injure every one that falls into their hands ; they slay children if found out after dark. As soon as the cock crows their power is at an end (*Bereshith rabba* c. 36).<sup>3</sup>

(e) Again, according to all three systems, it was believed that demons had a special predilection for certain places. As we have already seen, the Arabs held that desert places,<sup>4</sup> burial-grounds and ruined sites where men used to live were the special kinds of places where demons loved to congregate. With this Babylonian teaching agrees ; Namtaru, it is said, “rushes over the wilderness like a storm-wind,” Utukku and Ekimmu with their followers hover about in desert places and in mountainous regions, they are also to be found near tombs and in cemeteries.<sup>5</sup> This is entirely in accordance with Jewish belief on the subject ; they dwell mostly

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Ps. lix. 6, 14.    <sup>2</sup> OW. 11, OWlit. 148.

<sup>3</sup> FW. 255. One cannot help recalling the account of St. Peter's denial, Matt. xxvi. 34, etc.

<sup>4</sup> They believed that the weird moaning of the wind in the wilderness was the voice of demons, which “caused the locality to speak” (Wellh. 150) ; cf. “the howling wilderness,” Deut. xxxii. 10.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. OWlit. 148.

in the wilderness (*Berachoth* 3a), in waterless spots and among the tombs.<sup>1</sup> They are also to be found in all unclean places, e.g. in the *בֵּית הַכֶּסֶּם*; the same is true of Arab belief.<sup>2</sup>

(f) Further, the Arabs teach that demons have the power of becoming visible or invisible at will; a generic term for them is "the hidden ones"; they have also the power of assuming various forms.<sup>3</sup> Among the Babylonians it is said that "Ashakku places himself by the side of a man, and nobody sees him";<sup>4</sup> all demons could render themselves invisible; when they appeared in visible form it was usually in some animal that they did so<sup>5</sup> (see below). This power of becoming invisible and of assuming different shapes, whether animal or human, is likewise true of Jewish demonology; Satan, the head of the demons, is said, for example, to appear in the form of a beautiful woman (*Kiddushin* 81a) or of a beggar (*Ibid.*), Shēija appears in the shape of a bull (*Baba Kamma* 21a); one is never safe from demons on account of their thus appearing suddenly, or because of their unseen presence.<sup>6</sup>

(g) Another striking feature common to all three systems is the relation believed to exist between demons and certain animals. Concerning Arab belief the following details are of interest; some animals scent out the approach of demons when as yet men are unaware of their presence; thus, when a donkey brays or a cock crows it is a warning of the approach of a demon. Demons appear in the form of wild beasts in the wilderness;<sup>7</sup> even domestic animals are sometimes in league with them. Between some birds and demons there exists quite a friendship; such birds are crows, wood-

<sup>1</sup> FW. 254; cf. Mk. v. 2, Luke viii. 29, xi. 20.

<sup>2</sup> FW. 171; Wellh. 150. <sup>3</sup> Wellh. 149, 150; RS. 120. <sup>4</sup> OW. 16.

<sup>5</sup> Jastrow, 281.

<sup>6</sup> FW. 252 ff.; Bousset, 333.

<sup>7</sup> In this connexion it is worth noting that among the Phœnicians the lion was regarded as the incarnation of a demon (Pietschmann, *Op. cit.* p. 193).

peckers, owls and others ; owls are regarded as incarnations of the spirits of the departed ; ostriches <sup>1</sup> are used by the demons for riding upon, this is also true of foxes. But the closest connexion of all is that between the demons and *serpents* ; *Gann* and *Ghul* have become synonymous for "serpent" ; this applies also to *Shaitân* (=Satan).<sup>2</sup> It is no exaggeration when Wellhausen says that "the zoology of Islam is at once a demonology." Then, as regards Babylonian belief, it was believed that *Utukku*, *Ekimmu* and *Alu* appeared in the form of bulls ; the same applies to *Shedu*, one of the foremost demons. Indeed, all demons were conceived of as normally dwelling in animals ; it was the way in which the Babylonians explained to themselves the problem as to where the permanent abode of demons was, seeing that they were excluded from the realms of the dead. Among such animals those were chosen which were the most likely to inspire sudden fear, more especially serpents, which appeared suddenly, one knew not whence, and disappeared as suddenly, one knew not whither ; or again, scorpions, which were very injurious, and hid in spots where they often could not be noticed until too late. Many demons were also supposed to appear in bird form, or they were conceived of as hybrid monsters, birds with the heads of lions or donkeys, and the like<sup>3</sup> ; there were similar conceptions among the Arabs.<sup>4</sup> In the Jewish system it was taught that bulls, mosquitoes, donkeys and, above all, serpents were in league with the demons ; in *Pesachim* 112*b* there is the warning : "Do not stand still when a bull comes from the field, for Satan dances between his horns." Satan is, of course, identical with the serpent in the garden of Eden (*Sifre* 138*b*,

<sup>1</sup> RS. 129 *note*.

<sup>2</sup> Wellh. 152 ff. ; RS. 120, 121, 133.

<sup>3</sup> Jastrow, 281, and compare the representation of these hybrid monsters in Babylonian religious art.

<sup>4</sup> Wellh. 152.



*Beresh. rabba* c. 22, *Shabbath* 55*b*) ; and, according to *Baba Kamma* 16*a*, the *Shedim* were originally serpents, and became what they are by a process of evolution.<sup>1</sup>

(*h*) Lastly, a very significant *trait* common to all three systems is the belief in different *species* of demons. The Arabs regarded them as being divided into clans and tribes much in the same way as they themselves were.<sup>2</sup> Examples of the same kind of thing among the Babylonians are : the followers of Utukku, who form a different category from the followers of Ekimmu. So, too, the Jews reckoned, among the various species of demons, the *Shedim* (from the root שׁוּד, “to be violent”), the *Lîlîn* (from Lîlîth, “the night-hag,” whose followers they were [see further below]), and the *Ruchin* (from the root רִיחַ, “wind”) ; all these, however, come under the general term *Mazzikin*, which includes all the “harmful” spirits.<sup>3</sup>

These details form a very brief *résumé* of elements common to Arab, Babylonian and Jewish Demonology ; they will be supplemented by some illustrations when we deal with the ninety-first psalm.

### III.

The foregoing considerations certainly seem to offer some *a priori* grounds for expecting to find a system of demonology in the Old Testament. But, strictly speaking, there are some other considerations which ought to be taken into account in order to see how strong the case is for believing that numbers of indirect and covert references to demonology are to be found there. It is, however, possible to do no more here than make a mere reference to these. The whole subject of *Serpents* ought to be studied in reference to the Old Testament in this connexion ; we have briefly alluded to the relation supposed to exist between these and demons in

<sup>1</sup> FW. 252, 254, 256.    <sup>2</sup> Wellh. 149 ; RS. 120 ff.    <sup>3</sup> FW. 254 ff.

the Arab, Babylonian and Jewish systems ; a thorough study would probably show that in such passages as Exodus vii. 9 ff., Numbers xxi. 6 ff., Deuteronomy viii. 15, xxxii. 24, Isaiah xiv. 29, xxx. 6, lix 5, Jeremiah viii. 17, the idea of demons was originally present.<sup>1</sup> Another and altogether larger subject is that of Old Testament Angelology ; the very clear indications of this in the Old Testament amounts *ipso facto* to a proof that a corresponding demonology also existed there. Finally, and most important of all, there are the Old Testament conceptions concerning the departed, together with the mourning customs, details of which abound in the Old Testament ; many of these latter can be shown to be closely connected with belief in demons.<sup>2</sup> We referred above to the connexion between demons and departed spirits ; one has but to recall the mention of the *Rephaim*, and to remember that indications as to ancestor-worship are not wanting in the Old Testament, to realize the extended scope for a demonology which such beliefs offer.

How ineradicable the belief in demons is, and what an all-embracing part they play, in the everyday life of the Arabs, who according to the best authorities have retained their ancient Semitic beliefs and practices from time immemorial, can be seen by the study of such works as Doughty's *Arabia Deserta* and Curtiss' *Primitive Semitic Religion To-day*.

W. O. E. OESTERLEY.

### A FURTHER NOTE ON THE CRETANS.

IN the EXPOSITOR for last October I drew attention to a possible explanation of the severe language which is employed in the Epistle of Titus (Tit. i. 12) with regard to the

<sup>1</sup> See, for example, the interesting article "The subtle Serpent," by Mr. G. St. Clair in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, vii. pp. 40 ff. (Oct. 1905).

<sup>2</sup> E.g. rending the clothes, wailing, and the conception of the "uncleanness" of dead bodies ; cf. the writer's art. "The uncleanness of dead bodies" in *Church and Synagogue*, ix. 16 ff.

Cretans. It was well known from the statements of early writers that the famous hexameter verse in Titus came from a lost work of the poet, or prophet, Epimenides (for he was credited with mantic gifts as well as with literary skill), and it was also known, both in history and in literature, that Epimenides was himself a Cretan, a point emphasized in the Epistle to Titus, which became also the ground of a curious piece of logical by-play amongst the witty Greek philosophers (the Cretans being always liars, and Epimenides one of them). The suggestion that the attack on the lying Cretans had a religious motive, and was due, in the first instance, to the repulsion of the pious Greek from the statement that the tomb of great Zeus was to be seen in Crete, was accompanied by further inquiries in two directions. It was suggested that there was more of the lost Epimenides in the New Testament than had been suspected, and that, in particular, the famous sentence in Acts xvii. 28, "in Him we live and move and have our being," was another verse of the same poet, which stood originally in the same connexion as the famous verse about the Cretans, although it has been commonly credited to St. Paul: and the attempt was made to restore the sequence of the ideas of Epimenides. And in the next place, it was pointed out, what had already been suspected by certain anthropologists, that the dead-and-buried Zeus of the Cretans was not Zeus at all, but a deity closely allied to certain Asiatic cults, who would be best described by saying that he belonged to the type Dionysos-Attis-Adonis; that is, his ritual was one of the annual forms of the cult of the spirit of vegetation, where death and resurrection are represented under vegetable, animal and human forms with appropriate rites and sacrifices.

Much support was found for this theory in a statement, which was suspected to have come down through Theodore

of Mopsuestia, that the Cretan Zeus had been killed by a wild boar, exactly as in the story of Adonis, and, as has been suspected, in the story of Attis : and, in confirmation, it was pointed out that the Cretans of Praesos had a ritual in which the pig was a prominent feature, which may well have been due to the animal being the representative or equivalent of the deity, as the modern school explain the wild boar of the Adonis legends.

Such was the theory which I sketched out in elucidation of the legend of the lying Cretans and their buried god, and with some hope of throwing a fresh gleam of interpretation upon the famous address of St. Paul to the Areopagus.

As was to have been expected, the publication of the article brought me not a few interesting letters ; and as some of them are of real value, I venture to add a post-script to my former communication. In the first place, Professor Lock writes me from Oxford to say that my reference of the great sentence in Acts xvii. to Epimenides resolves a difficulty which he had often felt with regard to a passage in Athanasius. It will be best to let him state the point in his own words :

“ . . . I think that perhaps you may care for me to point out a thing that I have often noticed with wonder, and to which your note seems to give the explanation.

“ Athanasius, *De Incarn.* c. xiii., quotes ἐν αὐτῷ ζῶμεν καὶ κινούμεθα καὶ ἐσμέν not from St. Paul, but from Greek writers, καθὼς καὶ οἱ παρ’ αὐτοῖς συγγραφεῖς φασίν. I have always thought it a slip on his part, but probably he knew what he was doing. It is noticeable that he quotes vaguely from *writers*, even as St. Paul quotes *τινες τῶν καθ’ ὑμᾶς ποιητῶν*.”

If the suggestion that the quotation was from Epimenides had not been made on independent grounds, and if any one, on reading the 17th chapter of Acts, had been confronted

with the passage of Athanasius, and its apparent inclusion of the famous sentence within quotation marks, he would probably have explained the difficulty in the way that Professor Lock did, as a blunder of Athanasius. It was quite easy for a reader to make the sequence—

In Him we live and move and have our being,  
As certain also of your own poets have said,

especially if he did not notice the quotation of Aratus which was to follow: for the language of Athanasius is very close to that of the Acts, when we compare

*καθὼς καὶ οἱ παρ' αὐτοῖς συγγραφεῖς φασίν*

with

*ὥς καὶ τινες τῶν καθ' ὑμᾶς ποιητῶν εἰρήκασιν.*

But, as Dr. Lock points out, the difficulty disappears when we credit Athanasius with a little more knowledge: if the verse or sentence was really a bit of Epimenides, he was quite likely to have made the mental connexion; even without the encyclopædic knowledge of Clement of Alexandria (who is here content with recognizing Aratus) he might have found a source for the words and betrayed his discovery in the passage which perplexed Dr. Lock. What is really wanted in order to clear up the interpretation of Acts xvii. 28 is an added *καὶ* or a *καὶ πάλιν* in the manner of the Epistle to the Hebrews, as follows:

*καὶ πάλιν τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμέν.*

The next point to which my correspondents have drawn inquiry is the restoration of the supposed Epimenidean verse to its original form; there I am much indebted to my friends, Dr. J. H. Moulton and Mr. A. B. Cook. I may say, in passing, that the reason why I did not try my hand at restoring the verse was not merely a lack of trained skill in such matters, but a suspicion that perhaps we had not even yet got the substance of the verse in its pristine form. May it not have been that the original strain was “In Him



we live and *breathe* and are." My reason for this further query was due to the frequent recurrence of the connexion of "life and breath," especially in a triad. For instance, a few verses earlier, and in the same speech, St. Paul says that God gives to all men *life and breath and all things*, where the "breath" takes the place of the motion and seems to be the "motion" of the verse that comes later. A curious combination of the same ideas met my eye in the preface to the commentary of the Syrian father Ishodad on the Gospels, in the following sentence: "Evangel is a Greek word. It is interpreted in Syriac, Good Hope, our *life and motion and breath*," a conjunction which I am disposed to trace to a Greek source. I have been, therefore, expecting to turn up the Epimenidean verse in a somewhat different form from the sentence in the Acts. However, thus far my search has not been fruitful. And now for the restoration of the metrical form, which may be something like this:

Τύμβον ἐτεκτῆναντο σέθεν, κύνιστε μέγιστε,  
Κρήτες, αἰεὶ ψευδεῖς, κακὰ θηρία, γαστέρες ἀργαί.  
Ἄλλὰ σὺ γ' οὐ θνήσκεις, ἔστηκας γὰρ ζοὺς αἰεὶ,  
Ἐν γὰρ σοὶ ζῶμεν καὶ κινύμεθ' ἡδὲ καὶ ἔσμεν.

Perhaps that will do for a first attempt to restore the lost passage of Epimenides.

I come now to a further point in the explanation of the verse in the Epistle to Titus.

If we are right in our supposition that the attack on the Cretan liars was due, in the first instance, to the famous Cretan lie, it will follow that it is reasonable to refer the rest of the strong language of Epimenides to the same source. For why should we introduce the theory of general Cretan villainy into the argument, when the first clause of the indictment has become a particular offence. We are, then, bound to try for an explanation of the "evil

beasts and lazy gluttons " which shall be consistent with the assumed cult of a Cretan deity of the type of Dionysos, Attis, and Adonis. What was there especially beastly or ravenous about the Cretan cult? Obviously we have here some allusion to the sacrifices offered and partaken of. Now bearing in mind that the cult-animal is the substitute for the god and the means of communion with him, and that in cases like that of Adonis, where the god is said to have been destroyed by the animal, the result to which anthropologists come is that the god was primitively the animal, or at least the animal was his representative, and that the god was actually eaten in the form of the animal, the suggestion naturally arises that something similar has occurred in the supposed Zeus-cult of Crete. Here also we have the death of the deity by means of a wild-boar and the occurrence of a pig in the sacrifices. My suggestion, then, is that the early Cretans ate their deity sacramentally under the form of a pig: and I further conjecture that, as in so many similar cults, they ate the animal raw. This would at once explain why Epimenides called them not only liars, but also beasts and gluttons.

It would take too much space to adduce the parallels which justify these conjectures. They are not confined to the rituals of Dionysus, or Attis, or Adonis. They belong to a much wider area, and to a more widely diffused practice. But those who are following the investigations into primitive life and practice, which are becoming such a powerful factor in the story of religion, will be able to add from their own reading a variety of parallels to my attempted restoration of the primitive Cretan religion. And as this is only meant to be a supplementary note, I do not propose to go further with the matter at present.

J. RENDEL HARRIS.

## PISIDIAN ANTIOCH.

### X. FIRST APPEARANCE OF PAUL AND BARNABAS IN THE ANTIOCHIAN SYNAGOGUE.

WE turn now to study the visits which Paul paid to Antioch, and to compare the information given in the Acts with the results attained in the preceding Sections.

On his first visit Paul and Barnabas crossed the broad and rugged mountain region of Taurus, coming northward from Perga to Antioch probably in the late summer or autumn of the year 46<sup>1</sup> after Christ. As the narrative of Luke states the circumstances, the two Apostles entered the Synagogue as comparative strangers on the first Sabbath after their arrival, and took their seat. The Rulers of the Synagogue after the lessons for the day (probably from Deuteronomy i. and Isaiah i.)<sup>2</sup> had been read, sent them an invitation to address the congregation: "Brethren, if ye have any word [of exhortation for the people, say on."

It cannot be supposed that the Rulers would have invited any chance stranger to speak in public. We must therefore conclude either that Paul and Barnabas took their seats in some special place, showing thereby that they desired to address the people, or that previously they had made known to these Rulers their character and mission as teachers: perhaps both these preliminaries had been observed. The former alternative is adopted by J. Lightfoot, who supposes that they sat down in the place appropriated to the Rabbis. The example of Jesus in Luke iv. 16 shows that a person who desired to speak in the synagogue

<sup>1</sup> *Church in the Roman Empire*. p. 65 f.; *Pauline and Other Studies*, p. 365.

<sup>2</sup> The association between these two passages, which is found in the present table of Jewish lessons, is probably of very early origin.

had the opportunity permitted him by Jewish custom, just as is the Quaker custom still ; but there was this difference, that among the Jews the Rulers were charged with the superintendence of public worship, the choice of speakers, and general care for the order of the proceedings, whereas among the Quakers any one whom the Spirit prompts is free to rise and speak. It seems therefore probable that the Rulers satisfied themselves previously as to the qualifications of Paul and Barnabas ; and this implies either that some private communication had taken place before the public worship began, or that the Apostles had already been some time in Antioch and acquired a reputation as teachers and preachers.

Formerly I took the last view,<sup>1</sup> and supposed that that inattention to precise statement of the lapse of time, which characterized Luke in common with most ancient writers, made him here slur over a certain interval during which the Apostles lived and worked in Antioch till they had become noteworthy figures in the city. This supposition would explain how it came that the Rulers on a certain Sabbath invited the Apostles to address the congregation ; and it is quite in keeping with Luke's style of narrative that he should hurry over the early days of the residence in Antioch, and consecrate attention on the critical moment. At that time it seemed to me to be impossible and incredible that already, on the second Sabbath of their residence (xiii. 44), Paul and Barnabas should have succeeded in catching the ear of "almost the whole city" and in alienating the Jews. But further study has gradually brought me to a different view. That which once seemed impossible and incredible must be accepted as the fact. A similar change of opinion has come about in regard to many things during the last years of the nineteenth and the first years of the twentieth

<sup>1</sup> *St. Paul the Trav.* p. 99 f.

century: hundreds of assertions which would formerly have been pronounced incredible and impossible are now accepted as obvious statements of fact. The word "impossible" should rarely be used in criticism, or only in a different way from that in which it was formerly employed: it is a dangerous and question-begging term.

In this case Luke is quietly explaining and emphasizing that instantaneous and marvellous effect on the Galatians, which so deeply impressed Paul himself and which he describes in his letter, "ye received me as an angel of God." He was welcomed by the native pagan Galatians as one who came bringing the message of God, as one who must be believed and trusted implicitly, as one for whom nothing that they could do was too much, to whom they were ready to give up all that was dearest and to sacrifice their very eyes. Such a reception—that a pagan city should welcome a Jewish stranger as an angel of God—was marvellous, impossible, incredible; but Luke describes how it occurred; and this striking agreement between Acts and the Epistle proves that we must accept to the fullest extreme the strange and at first sight almost incredible account given by Luke. Paul was invited to address the audience in the Synagogue on the first Sabbath after he arrived. Weak and showing traces of an illness which was popularly regarded as a direct infliction of Divine wrath on a guilty and accursed person, he was received by the heathen part of his audience at least not with contempt or disapproval as outcast and cursed by God, but with enthusiasm as the messenger come from God.<sup>1</sup>

This striking inauguration of the Galatian mission, natu-

<sup>1</sup> That which was a trial to you in my physical frame ye despised not, but received me as an angel of God (Gal. iv. 14). The effects of the illness were apparent when Paul came to Galatia, as the quotation clearly shows. It is quite extraordinary that scholars, in spite of Paul's own words, should maintain that the illness began after he came to Galatia.



rally, made a deep impression on Paul's mind, as we see throughout the impassioned outpouring of his feelings in the Galatian letter. While we cannot explain with perfect confidence exactly how it was that the Rulers came to invite these strangers to speak, we must accept the fact that it was so. Just as at Philippi (xvi. 13), so at Pisidian Antioch, the events of the first Sabbath in a new city and a strange land are described with especial interest and minuteness by the historian—a good example of his method in narrative.

#### XI. PAUL'S FIRST ADDRESS TO A GALATIAN AUDIENCE.

A speech delivered on an occasion like this must be interesting to the student of history. The question must be asked, whether we have in Acts xiii. 16–41 a report of that speech, or merely an address embodying in Luke's own language his conception of the way in which Paul was in the habit of appealing to a mixed audience such as might gather in a Synagogue of the western Jewish Diaspora. This important question is sometimes put in a misleading fashion, as for example in the long footnote in Meyer-Wendt's *Kommentar*, eighth edition, p. 234, where it is expressed in the form of an alternative; either this address was found by the author of Acts in the written Source on which he was dependent in this part of his work, or it is the author's free invention without any authority. Neither alternative is correct. Both are false. But when the question is so expressed, the unwary reader, like the incautious critic, is readily seduced into the belief that one or other alternative must be right; and, as the style and vocabulary of the Lukan writings have influenced the passage, there is an almost inevitable tendency towards the conclusion that we have in this passage a freely invented oration which the author of Acts considered suitable for the

occasion and characteristic of Paul. Luke was not in this part of his work dependent on any written Source, but on information from the actors and eye-witnesses, and on his own personal knowledge.<sup>1</sup> His style has free play, when he is reporting in brief a long speech.

Let us therefore take the address as Luke reports it, and consider its character and its suitability to the audience before whom it is said to have been delivered.

In the first place we observe that it is not addressed to the Jews of the Synagogue alone. From the opening to the close it is addressed to the double audience, the Jews and the God-fearing Gentiles,<sup>2</sup> all pagans by education, but attracted within the circle of Jewish influence in virtue of a certain natural affinity in them to the lofty morality of the teaching in the Synagogue.

Nor is this double address expressed in the way of depreciating the second kind of auditors as an inferior class. There is nothing resembling the tone of the modern Greek priest in a Greek village of Macedonia, where a small body of Wallachian settlers, too poor to have a church of their own, attended the Greek service, and listened to the address of the priest: "Christian Brethren, and ye Wallachians."<sup>3</sup> Paul's opening words are perfectly courteous to both classes, "Men of Israel and ye that fear God, hearken."

Incidentally we observe here how inaccurate is the view taken of this address in the above-quoted footnote of Meyer-

<sup>1</sup> See, for example, Harnack's *Lukas der Arzt*, and the review of that work in *EXPOSITOR*, December, 1906, February, 1907.

<sup>2</sup> There can be no doubt that this is the meaning of the formula so often employed by Luke. "Those that feared God" were in a sense pagans still, they had not professedly and overtly abandoned paganism.

<sup>3</sup> I speak of a period fully forty years ago, before racial hatreds became so intense as they are now, when such a mixed audience has become almost an impossibility. I heard the story twenty-seven years ago from a British subject, speaking Greek with perfect fluency, who had resided for business purposes in Thessaly and southern Macedonia.

Wendt's *Kommentar* : Dr. Wendt states the opinion that this address is a free composition by the author of the Acts, in which he tried to exemplify the way that Paul on his missionary journey preached the Gospel before the Jews. The distinguished commentator has failed to observe the most important fact about this address, the fact which gives character and effect to it, that it includes in its clearly-expressed scope the Gentiles from first to last. What help for the understanding of the speech can be expected from a discussion which leaves out of count the most essential and remarkable fact in the address ?

In the second place, as the orator proceeds and grows warm in his subject, his address becomes still more complimentary to the God-fearing Gentiles and actually raises them to the same level with the Jews as "Brethren." At first he had distinguished the two classes of auditors, Jews and God-fearing ; but in xiii. 26 he sums them up all together with a loftier courtesy as "Brethren, children of the stock of Abraham, and those among you that fear God." Doubtless this was the first occasion on which either in this or in any other Synagogue the Gentiles had been addressed by a Jew as "Brethren."<sup>1</sup> Then finally in verse 38 the distinction of two classes in the audience disappears, and all are identified on the higher plane of Christian thought as "Brethren." Here we stand on the same level as in the Galatian letter iii. 26-30, "Ye are all sons of God . . . there can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female : for ye are all one in Christ Jesus."

What a development here appears from the language which Paul had used to Peter in a Gentile city before a

<sup>1</sup> That Brethren is not confined to the first class, but common to both, is shown by verse 38 ; by the comparison of the climax from 16, through 26, to 38 ; and by the terms *ἡμῖν* and *ὕμῖν* in 26.

Gentile audience only a short time before! "We being Jews by nature and not sinners of the Gentiles." It is, of course, true that the words were uttered dramatically, as Paul was speaking from the point of view of his Jewish antagonists and employing their language. But even with this explanation I feel no longer able to hold the opinion expressed in *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 138 f., that that scene occurred immediately before the Apostolic Council. After hesitating long I find myself decisively driven over to the view which at first I rejected<sup>1</sup> (but which my friend Mr. F. Warburton Lewis has often urged on me) that the visit of Peter to Antioch (Gal. ii. 11 ff.) preceded the first missionary journey of Paul and Barnabas, and that he was sent from Jerusalem as far as Syrian Antioch to inspect and report on this new extension of the Church, just as he had been sent previously to Samaria along with John on a similar errand.

Accordingly we see that the sermon at Pisidian Antioch was given by Luke in such detail, not merely because it inaugurated an important stage in the development of Paul's sphere of work, viz. the beginning of the Galatian Churches, but also because it represented a new step in his thought and method.

## XII. THE APPROACH TO THE GENTILES.

But, while the Gentiles are associated on a footing of such perfect equality with the Jews in this address, they are regarded entirely on the side of their approach to the Jewish beliefs, and not the faintest reference is made to their own religious conceptions apart from and previous

<sup>1</sup> Always, however, with a good deal of hesitation; from the very first sketch of *St. Paul the Traveller* onwards there were often times when this view (which now at last I adopt definitely) exerted a strong force on me.

to Judaism. In that respect this sermon stands in marked contrast to the oration to the Athenians and the brief address to the Lystran mob, in which Christian doctrine is set before the auditors as the development of their own natural conceptions of and aspirations towards the Divine power. Here, on the contrary, the God-fearing Gentiles are addressed as standing on the same plane of thought with the Jews, and the correct text (followed in the Revised Version)<sup>1</sup> shows that the Jews in the Synagogue did not at the moment appreciate (any more than Dr. Wendt appreciates) the importance of the inclusion of the Gentiles by Paul in his address and in his gospel. The topics were so purely Jewish that the appeal to the Gentiles, though clearly marked, was ignored as a mere piece of courtesy by the Jews generally or regarded as accidental. Possibly some of the Jews were offended already by this extreme complaisance to the Gentiles, but they are not alluded to by the historian, who only says that many of the Jews and Gentiles followed the Apostles, when they continued their mission.

But on the next Sabbath almost the whole city flocked to the Synagogue. It was now clearly apparent what interpretation was put on the words of Paul. Even the Gentiles who had not previously been attracted within the circle of the Synagogue came to hear the new message of a widened Judaism. The teaching, which on the first Sabbath had been allowed to pass without open disapproval and had even been welcomed by many of the Jews, was now openly

<sup>1</sup> xiii. 43; Revised Version, "And as they went out they besought that these words might be spoken to them the next Sabbath." The Authorized Version (on which see the end of the Section) is due to an ancient alteration in the text intended to bring it into conformity with a mistaken conception of the nature of the situation. From verse 45 it was concluded that the Jews could not have joined in the invitation to Paul; and "the Gentiles" were introduced as sole givers of the invitation.



contradicted, when one or both of the Apostles addressed the crowded assembly. The Jews of Antioch were not prepared to admit the Gentiles to an equality with themselves.

No explanation is given in the oration quoted by Luke of the way in which this equality which Paul preached was explained and justified by him. The equalization is simply assumed and acted upon. "You," throughout the speech, embraces Jews and Gentiles. "We" in xiii. 26 includes all who will. But one cannot suppose that the entire Gospel was explained in one oration to an audience wholly unprepared for it. The aim of the sermon was to drive home into the minds of the audience one or two fundamental principles, especially the universality of the gospel; and the subsequent events showed that this part of the message was caught with avidity by the hitherto unprivileged Gentiles in the audience. The oration was only the introduction, not the completion, of a course of instruction.

This consideration shows the unreasonableness of Professor McGiffert's criticism of the oration; he regards it as composed by Luke, and not as a trustworthy reproduction of what Paul said. He points out that in xiii. 39, "where it is said that 'every one that believeth is justified from all things from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses,' a conception of justification is expressed, which, if not distinctly un-Pauline, nevertheless falls far below Paul's characteristic and controlling idea of justification as the state of the saved man who is completely reconciled to God and enjoys peace with him." Dr. McGiffert's words are quite correct, but his inference that Paul could not have made the statement is incorrect. This statement was a first step towards making the new idea intelligible to minds wholly unprepared for understanding the full Pauline conception. That able modern scholar and

writer sees that the statement, though "not un-Pauline," is incompletely Pauline; that is precisely what we should expect in such a preparatory announcement. But, when Dr. McGiffert regards "the forgiveness of sins" (xiii. 38) as sufficiently un-Pauline to excite suspicion, we find no reality in his criticism. Even if the words were never used by Paul elsewhere, it is mere pedantry to regard the idea as un-Pauline; but they occur (as the learned critic mentions) in Ephesians i. 7 and Colossians i. 14. They are a simpler and less philosophic expression of a process which Paul dwells on always, but as a rule in a more mystic and more transcendental way—a process which every Christian preacher must in some form or other always dwell on.

The occurrence of such simpler, as one might say pre-Pauline or preparatory-Pauline, expressions at the climax of the address is eminently suitable to the situation and strongly confirms the character of this oration as a trustworthy report of the speech actually delivered by the Apostle in the Galatian Synagogue.

It is needless to repeat here the analysis of the topics in this address which are described by Paul in the Epistle as having constituted his teaching to the Galatians. They are treated in my *Historical Commentary on Galatians*, pp. 399–401, to which I may be permitted to refer. The common topics there described are:—

(1) The history of the Jewish people becomes intelligible only as leading onward to a higher development: this higher stage came in "the fulness of time" (Gal. iv. 4), and constituted the climax of their history, when God fulfilled His promise, and when the Jews by condemning Jesus fulfilled prophecy (Acts xiii. 27, 32 f.).

(2) The promise given originally to the Jews cannot be fulfilled except through Christ. Such is the burden of the Epistle and of the address. The Law cannot save: it is

incomplete: it cannot justify:<sup>1</sup> through Christ every one that hath faith is justified (Acts xiii. 23, 32 f., 38 f.).

(3) Christ must be hanged on a tree and be accursed (Gal. iii. 13, Acts xiii. 29).

(4) Christ is not dead, though He was slain (xiii. 30, 32 f., 34 f., 37).

This is not a complete outline of Paulinism, but it is a characteristic sketch preparatory to the evangelizing of an audience which knew nothing but the Law. It is not what a later writer would compose as a presentation of Paulinism to any audience; but it is the way in which, as we cannot deny, Paul might well take the first steps to introduce his gospel to such an audience as this. The idea of liberty, which is so prominent in the Epistle, could not suggest itself at this stage before a mixed audience. It belongs to the further ministration after xiii. 47.

The Received Text of xiii. 42, which appears in the Authorized Version, "when the Jews were gone out of the Synagogue, the Gentiles besought that these words might be preached to them the next Sabbath" (apart from the mistranslation<sup>2</sup> of the first participle) misses the delicacy of the situation, exaggerates the share attributed to the Gentiles in the action, and gives a quite irrational picture of the situation. We cannot possibly admit that the Jews could depart first from the Synagogue and leave the Gentiles alone with Paul in it. Even with a correct translation, "while the Jews were going out of the Synagogue," the situation as described remains almost the same, for the

<sup>1</sup> In the address Paul does not actually go further than that the Law cannot justify in all things, xiii. 39; but this is already un-Jewish, and suggests much more than it actually says.

<sup>2</sup> ἐξιόντων cannot possibly imply that the Jews "were gone out of the Synagogue," but only that they were in the act of going out or on the point of going out. This stage is antecedent to xiii. 43, when the Synagogue had broken up and the audience had been dismissed.

Jews are still represented as beginning to go out and leaving the Gentiles gathered round Paul and Barnabas ; and, moreover, this reading anticipates the situation as it developed in the ensuing week, whereas the Jews did not understand its nature until the following Sabbath. Moreover, the evidence of the manuscripts is overwhelming and indubitable.

It is gathered from xiii. 42 by some commentators that Paul and Barnabas went out beforehand<sup>1</sup> and afterwards the Synagogue was dismissed. But the words "as they were going out," may very well be interpreted as referring to the time occupied in the gradual departure of a large audience. During the breaking up of the audience the hearers in general asked that the address might be repeated, a request which (as we must understand) the Rulers complied with. After the breaking up occurred the scene described in the following verse.

### XIII. THE DOOR OF THE GENTILES.

This turning away from the Jews to address the Gentiles directly and alone was a very important step in the development of the Pauline evangelization. That it was made now for the first time seems certain. It is the method of Luke to emphasize the great stages in the development of the Church ; and the attention which he devotes to this address would alone be a sufficient proof that it marked a decisive step in advance. Moreover, on their return to Syrian Antioch, Paul and Barnabas reported about their journey and its results ; and the fact on which they laid special stress was that God "had opened a door of faith to the Gentiles" during this journey.

The address to the Synagogue was not the opening of the door : it was only a preliminary that led up to that

<sup>1</sup> So Meyer-Wendt.

decisive step. It is only in xiii. 46 that the step is actually described. When Paul took this step, the door was opened for the Gentiles to enter direct into the Church (instead of through the Synagogue).<sup>1</sup> It was not opened in Cyprus, for there Paul and Barnabas spoke only in the synagogues, Barnabas, not Paul, was the leader, and Paul still appeared in his Hebrew character under the name of Saul. It had not been open in Syrian Antioch, for there also the leader was Barnabas, and Paul appeared only as the Hebrew Saul in a subordinate position ; and no reasonable doubt can exist that the Christian teaching in Syrian Antioch reached the Gentiles through the Synagogue and not direct : had the door stood open already there, it would not have been necessary or correct for Paul and Barnabas to report that God had opened a door to the Gentiles on the journey.

Can we gather from the general situation any information to explain how it was that Paul made such a distinct step forward in his outlook and method at this time ? It is quite natural that the idea of the gospel of the Gentiles, deep-seated in his mind, should gradually translate itself into action, and grow stronger and more commanding as it becomes more active. That this must have been so lies in the nature of the case ; and Luke's narrative marks the gradual development very clearly. It was never part of this author's method formally to state reasons and estimate causes ; but he certainly conceived that Paul's missionary aims gradually expanded and developed, and he certainly modelled his history so as to exhibit the steps by which this development took place : no one has any doubt as to this intention on the part of the author of *Acts* : the only doubt is as to his competence and trustworthiness in carrying out his intention.

<sup>1</sup> The meaning of this step is more fully discussed in *St. Paul the Traveller, passim*.



What, then, was it that led Paul to take this large and sudden step onwards in his course at the very beginning of his Galatian mission ? The answer to this question must be to a great extent conjectural and dependent on a more or less subjective estimate of the preceding conditions. The sole authority is Luke ; and we have to try to divine the purpose in his mind, prompting his choice and his emphasis ; and this attempt must inevitably be conditioned by personal judgment about Luke's character as a historian.

In the first place we cannot but notice that this event comes shortly after the scene in Paphos, where Paul for the first time became the leader. At Paphos also he ceases to be conceived by Luke as a mere Jew among Jews ; and the change in his name marks a change in method and outlook. The first missionary action which Luke mentions after this change was the speech in the Antiochian Synagogue, for the residence in Pamphylia had been rendered abortive by the illness, which was still affecting him when he spoke in the Antiochian Synagogue, but which the Galatians overlooked in their enthusiastic reception. We must understand that Luke marks the three steps in the process of opening of the door as (1) the scene in Paphos, (2) the first Galatian sermon addressing Greeks and Jews as equal, (3) the turning away from the Jews to address the Gentiles directly and outside of the Synagogue.

In the second place, Paul was now entering a new country, where the conditions of life and the relations of Jews to Gentiles were probably different from those to which he was accustomed. An orator like him must have been sensitive to the new conditions and guided almost unconsciously by them. There was something in the moral atmosphere of the Synagogue at Antioch that led him on to the issue of addressing the Gentiles as " Brethren "

equally with the Jews, and exhibiting the Gospel ("placarding it before them," as in Gal. iii. 1) as their own. Can we determine what was this electric quality, to which Paul was sensitive? Surely, it is to be connected with the friendly relations of Jew and Gentile. We should not expect that in an ordinary Graeco-Roman city, almost the whole population would gather<sup>1</sup> to hear a Jew preach to them in the atmosphere of a Synagogue. What was it that made the Antiochians do this? That they should do so must be regarded as on a parallel with the general sympathy of spirit that existed between Anatolians and Jews. This sympathy I have elsewhere described.<sup>2</sup> The ancient people of Phrygia was the ground-stock into which melted and was absorbed both the old conquering tribes of Phryges or Bryges from Europe and the Magnesians colonists of the third century: it had marked affinity with the Semitic peoples. In the character of this ground-stock lies the explanation, both why Paul now was drawn on to address them so sympathetically in his first speech, and why later they attempted to reconcile his teaching with a strict and complete obedience to the Jewish Law (an attempt which elicited the Epistle to the Galatians). Only such an affinity could render it possible that almost the whole population crowded to hear the Jewish stranger preach his message to themselves.

A possible objection that may suggest itself on a hasty view may here be alluded to. We have laid much stress on the Hellenized character of Pisidian Antioch, and on its diversity from the purely Anatolian character of the surrounding population; and yet now we are laying stress

<sup>1</sup> A certain degree of rhetorical stress and exaggeration may perhaps be felt in the expression; but one cannot doubt that a large and impressive concourse of citizens to the Synagogue took place.

<sup>2</sup> *Historical Commentary on Galatians*, p. 194 f., 256, etc.

on the fundamentally Anatolian spirit of the Antiochians. It may be thought that these are inconsistent opinions. There is, however, no real inconsistency between them, and the reader who detects inconsistency fails to conceive rightly the Graeco-Oriental character in those Seleucid colonies of Phrygia. In them Hellenic education adapted itself to Oriental peoples, and in doing so was profoundly modified in spirit. Each of those cities was an experiment in the amalgamation of the Oriental and the Western. Therein lies their deep interest. They were attempting to do, and on the whole with remarkable success, what must be achieved on a wider scale at the present day if the peace of the world is to be maintained and progress to be made. The warfare and antagonism between Eastern and European has to be changed for peaceful interpenetration, which will result not in domination of the one over the other, but in harmonious development of a reconciled common civilization, in which each side contributes what the other lacks.<sup>1</sup>

Accordingly, the mass of the population of Antioch was Hellenic or Hellenized: it was not, however, Greek, but Graeco-Oriental. Hellenism is rather an educational fact than a racial fact. Even the Magnesians who had colonized Antioch were not a Greek people racially; they came from a Hellenized city of Anatolia, in which the mixture of Greek blood can have been only slight. It was precisely in those Graeco-Oriental cities that the Jews found themselves most at home. In the strictly Greek cities of European Greece the Jews seem never to have been able to affect such an accommodation with their Greek neighbours.

The appeal which Paul made to the non-Jewish Antiochian Galatians was evidently addressed mainly to the older population, the Hellenized Anatolian, not the Roman,

<sup>1</sup> *Letters to the Seven Churches*, Preface.

section of the city. Consideration of the circumstances will bring this out clearly.

Not the whole city had come to hear Paul. There was a class that did not come ; and it is easy to see what class it was that was not interested. It was the class to which belonged the women of rank to whom the Jews soon after had recourse in order to excite persecution against Paul. That is to say, it was the Roman colonists, the local aristocracy. They were not drawn so much to the Synagogue. An address in Greek would not be so attractive to them, for Greek had not yet become their home language, as it did two centuries later.<sup>1</sup> They had not the same affinity of spirit with the Semites as the older population had. An aristocracy is, as a rule, not so easily and quickly affected by missionary influence as the humbler classes are.

This class, which did not come to the Synagogue in any great numbers, held the reins of government ; it was the privileged burgher class. To it the Jews went for help, moving it through the women who belonged to it.

In conclusion we cannot but observe that the narrative of Acts implies a very marked concord and friendly relations between the Jews and the other two chief sections of the Antiochian people. The man of the population gathers in the Synagogue. The governing coloni are easily induced by the Jews to act against the strangers, and it can hardly be doubted that the charge against them was that they had disturbed the harmony of the state. This picture of the Roman Colonia is very favourable, and is quite in accordance with all that has been gathered from the extra-Biblical evidence.

#### XIV. THE RELIGION OF ANTIOCH.

The chief god of Antioch was Men, as Strabo mentions,

<sup>1</sup> See EXPOSITOR, March 1907, p. 285.

and his authority is confirmed by the coins and by the inscriptions of the city. One of the commonest types on the very numerous and varied coins of the Colonia shows the god (named on many *Mensis* in the Latin translation), a standing fully draped figure wearing the Phrygian high-pointed cap on his head, with the horns of the crescent moon appearing above and behind his shoulders : he rests his left arm on a column to bear the weight of a Victory which stands on his hand, and raises the left knee to plant the foot on a bull's head lying on the ground : in his right hand he holds a long sceptre : beside his right foot a cock stands on the ground. The complicated symbolism is difficult to interpret ; but certainly it shows the effort of Greek anthropomorphic art to indicate a complex Divine idea, remote from any strictly Greek conception. The bull's head often appears on tombstones in Asia Minor, and was certainly widely employed as a symbol that was efficacious to avert evil. The cock also occurs alone as the type on the reverse of some small Antiochian coins : in such cases it is doubtless to be understood as a part standing for the whole of the Divine image, when the representation had to be simplified and abbreviated on a small coin. The meaning of the symbol is obscure. The Victory which he bears on his hand marks him as the supreme god and victorious power.

The resemblance of the name Men to the Greek word Men (month) led to much confusion and even error<sup>1</sup> regarding the correspondence between Anatolian and Greek religious ideas. It was falsely supposed that the Anatolian deity Men was simply the Moon-god<sup>2</sup> ; and the objects above

<sup>1</sup> The error was made by the Greeks, and has been commonly followed by modern scholars.

<sup>2</sup> Hence also his name was mistranslated in Latin as *Mensis* on coins and *Luna* in an inscription, C.I.L. III. 6829.



his shoulders were misunderstood as the horns of the crescent moon, whereas originally they were probably only wings as represented in archaic art. The symbolism shows that the Men of Antioch was not the mere embodiment of a single object like the moon, but an envisagement of the general Divine idea, supreme and many-sided. He was simply the great god ; and his name Men was probably a shortened form of the longer Manes, which also occurs widely as the name of an Anatolian deity.

The variety of Greek names that were applied to Men at Antioch (as seen in the inscriptions) also indicate that his nature was very complex, so that he could be plausibly identified with widely diverse Greek gods. He is called Dionysos, Apollo and Asklepios ; and he must therefore have been the giver of wine, the god of prophecy (or the sun-god), and the great physician. In short, he is the Anatolian supreme god, the impersonation of their entire conception of the Divine nature and power.

In the religion that was characteristic of Central Anatolia generally and of Phrygia especially, the principal deity was not male but female. The Great Mother was to the Phrygian peoples the true and supreme embodiment of the Divine nature. The god was secondary and subordinate, though always a necessary element in her life inasmuch as the Divine life was the model and prototype of human life and human society. In various districts of the country we find that the god stands forth most prominently in the exoteric form of the religion ; but even there, if we can penetrate beneath the surface, we find that in the esoteric ritual of the Mysteries the goddess was the prominent personality, and the god was only secondary. The exoteric form of the religion was largely determined by historic conditions and especially by mixture of races. New peoples, among whom the female sex occupied a less honoured and influential position than

it did in the primitive Anatolian society, came to be widely dominant in Central Anatolia. These new peoples must, of course, recognize the old religion of the country; and generally they recognized it as their supreme religion; but the new social conditions demanded new religious forms to correspond to them, and the god was publicly more acknowledged and regarded than the goddess.

It might, therefore, be plausibly conjectured that in the more secret ritual of the Antiochian god, the Great Goddess would assume great prominence. We are, however, not reduced to conjecture; clear evidence exists that such was the case. A glance into the history of the Antiochian cult is necessary to show the character of this evidence.

The region of Antioch and the Limnai<sup>1</sup> was the property in primitive times of an ancient hieron and priestly establishment<sup>2</sup> which exercised theocratic authority over a wide district and a large subject population. Strabo says that Antioch was the centre and seat of this priestly establishment; but this is not exactly correct. Antioch was a Greek foundation within the territory of the hieron; and there was in the city a temple of the local religion in an outwardly Hellenized form. The true seat of the old cult was nearer to the north-eastern corner of the great double lake called Limnai; but exact localization can hardly be made without excavations.

The territory of the deity was probably taken possession of by the Seleucid kings, part being used to found Antioch, and perhaps part to found Apollonia. When the Romans destroyed the Seleucid rule over these parts of Asia Minor in 189 B.C., they set Antioch (and doubtless also Apollonia)

<sup>1</sup> χώρα, Acts xiii. 49, Sterret, *Epigraph. Journey*, no. 92, p. 121 (where *πεγεωνάριον*, i.e. *regionarium*, is the true reading).

<sup>2</sup> The inscriptions afford no evidence of a college of priests; but the analogy of Pessinus and of the Ormelian *hieron* may be regarded as conclusive.

free. The property of the hieron and the priests was then restored; and the old theocracy lasted until the formation of the Province Galatia in 25 B.C., when the vast estates of the god became Imperial property, as Strabo mentions.<sup>1</sup> In place of government by the god through his priests (a system which apparently had not been changed by the kings, who doubtless made the priests the representatives and agents of the reigning king), a more Roman method of administration was inaugurated. The inscriptions are not sufficient to furnish conclusive evidence, but they point to the view that the Imperial administration through a Procurator (an Imperial freedman) and Actor or Actores (Imperial slaves) was veiled to some degree under old forms, so that the Procurator was priest of the cultus. The population of the estates<sup>2</sup> were subjects directly of the Emperor, and did not form part of the Provincia. They were enrolled in a religious association (*collegium*), worshipping the Emperor and the ancient Phrygian deity. The supreme deity is frequently mentioned as Great Artemis. She was the old Phrygian Mother Goddess, the unwedded mother, nourisher, teacher and ruler of all her people; and the forms of the cult, so far as allusion occurs to them, are those of the old Phrygian religion, with a body of subordinate priests or ministers called by the ancient title Galloi and an Archigallos as their chief. All these Galloi and Archigallos were under the Procurator's authority.

The Roman administration and the old Phrygian system on these estates are treated, as far as the evidence permits, in the writer's paper, *Studies in the History of the Eastern Provinces*, pp. 305-377, where all the evidence is collected.

<sup>1</sup> His account is not quite clear, and probably he himself did not exactly comprehend what took place, as he had never visited Antioch. In all probability the Divine property had been taken by Amyntas, and passed as part of his inheritance to Augustus.

<sup>2</sup> ὄχλος, *plebs collegii*.

The religion of Antioch was in origin identical with the Artemis worship of the native population on the estates ; but Hellenic education and custom imparted a certain superficial alteration to the cult without giving any really Greek character to it. The "very manifest god Dionysos," as the god is styled in one inscription, is not really more Greek in character than Men himself. The citizens were Hellenes in education. They had the tone inevitably nurtured in freemen, who for generations had exercised the sovereign rights of self-government through elective magistrates, and had met for free discussion in public meetings, Thus they were raised intellectually far above the level of the still half-enslaved Phrygian population on the Imperial estates around Antioch, and in such a position the Hellenic pride of birth and intellect must have been fostered and strengthened. But in religion and in racial temperament they were Anatolian (except the colonial Romans, who were still a separate and superior caste in the time of St. Paul).

W. M. RAMSAY.

## THE SITE OF CAPERNAUM.

### No. II.

#### TELL HUM *v.* KHAN MINYEH.

As the Rev. Asad Mansur, curate to the Rev. Charles Augustus Manley of Nazareth, who accompanied me to the Sea of Galilee in January, 1906, takes a different view of the site of Capernaum from that which I have formed, and stated in the *EXPOSITOR* of July ; and as his letter to me on the subject only reached me after my own article was dispatched to the editor, I think it well to send the larger part of his interesting paper as a supplemental article, omitting only a few points already mentioned by me. His discussion of it illustrates the difficulty of determining the site with absolute confidence ; although several correspondents have written to me to say that they think I have proved the point I tried to establish, and Mr. James Cohen, of the Free Church of Scotland mission—who accompanied us on the expedition at the request of Dr. Torrance of Tiberias—writes that he agrees with me as to Khan Minyeh being the real site. I send Mr. Mansur's letter with the greater confidence as Mr. Manley has kindly translated it from Arabic into English. I may perhaps return to the subject at a later date, as it is certainly worthy of additional study and research.

WILLIAM KNIGHT.

---

#### A JOURNEY WITH PROFESSOR KNIGHT TO TIBERIAS AND ITS VICINITIES.

##### *Part I.*

On January 23, 1906, Professor Knight of St. Andrew's University, Scotland, arrived at Nazareth. He had previously written to the Rev. C. A. Manley, C.M.S., and myself,



asking that, if possible, one of us should accompany him to the Lake. It was my privilege to have that honour accorded me.

We left Nazareth about 2.30 p.m. the same afternoon, and after a somewhat tiresome drive on account of the bad state of the roads, we reached Tiberias at 8.30 p.m. The rest of the evening was occupied in making the necessary arrangements for our trip to Tell Hum and the north-west shore of the Lake.

Next day, Wednesday, January 24, at 8 a.m., we took boat. There was with us also Mr. James Cohen, of the Free Church of Scotland Mission. Dr. Torrance had kindly asked him to render us all the assistance he could.

After the boatmen had rowed a short distance they spread sail, and the boat made good way. We did not experience on this occasion a storm such as came down on our Lord and his disciples, although we gathered from the fear written on the faces of the rowers, when the slightest wind arose, what such an experience must be.

We then asked them to take us to the place where the Jordan enters the Lake. This they refused to do, saying that they were only four in number, and that the wind was rising in the East. The wind was not at that moment very strong, but the fear was that later in the day it would gather strength. Indeed, on our return to Tiberias, we kept close to the western shore of the Lake to avoid the wash of the waves.

We arrived at Tell Hum about 10 a.m. Our boat was anchored in the little harbour. This had all the appearance of modern workmanship about it ; but when one landed and viewed the ancient ruins, one could not but feel that there must have been a harbour in olden days suitable to the magnificence of those splendid buildings.

After leaving the landing-place, a few steps brought us

to the garden of the Latin monastery. Here are the ruins recently excavated by the German Archæological Society. They are different from all others found on the western shores of the Lake, being composed of large white limestones, whereas the prevailing stone elsewhere is the black basalt. These stones are covered with symbolical carvings. We noticed representations of vines with clusters of grapes hanging from them, palm trees laden with dates, pomegranates and pear-trees with their respective fruits clinging to their branches. We also noted carvings of the seven-branched candlestick, the pot of manna, and two intersected triangles of star-like form. We long wondered over these symbols, and wished to know whether this was the site of Capernaum, and if we were gazing on the ruins of the old synagogue which the centurion built, and in which Christ had taught. We were told that the Latin monks intend rebuilding the synagogue on its old foundations, and replacing as far as possible the old stones in their original positions.

We then left these ruins by a door on the south-west, and found about thirty to forty workers—men and women—busy building a wall round a large space of ground. On asking the foreman what they were doing, he said that this space was for a garden ; but report says that a church and monastery are to be built on it, and that on this site there are important ruins which are at present covered over.

After this we re-entered our boat, and bore a little to the south-west. In a quarter of an hour we arrived at *Tannur Eyub* (Job's oven), probably so called from the shape of a pool in that place. Here we once more disembarked, and after three minutes' walk between dry grass, thorns, bushes, and oleander trees, we reached the highest point of the *octagonal fountain pool*. This is built in the side of the hill, and is called to-day *Birket Dahir el-'Amr*. From

the bottom of it there wells up a spring which is said to be the largest in Galilee ; and a little lower down on the shore of the Lake a mill is worked by means of the water, which is brought to it through an aqueduct. The present masonry of the fountain pool, the aqueduct, and the mills are reputed to be the work of the famous Dâhir-el-'Amr, who lived in the middle of the eighteenth century.

The water does not now rise to the full height of the fountain basin, but issues out through an aqueduct built up the slope of the hill from the mill, and, so to speak, joining or tapping the basin of the pool near its bottom. No doubt formerly the water issued from a place higher up in the basin, at a depth of about two feet from its lip or rim, as will be explained later on.

I went up the valley to the north-west of the fountain pool. We might well call this a "little plain." I was following the traces of an aqueduct, and having walked for only a few minutes discovered that it is of modern date, but for what purpose it was made I could not ascertain.

\* \* \* \* \*

My opinion is as follows :—

1. I do not think that a civilized government like that of the Romans would leave waters so copious to fall into the Lake without using it for irrigation purposes, which could be done without much difficulty.

2. In our Lord's time this part of the country was densely populated, which would mean that the inhabitants would have to take advantage of any way of increasing their means of livelihood.

3. I have no doubt that the water formerly issued, not as at present from the lower part of the basin, but from the upper part, near the rim.<sup>1</sup> My reason for this statement is as follows :—Standing near the present mills a little to

<sup>1</sup> The depth of the basin from the lip to the bottom is about 20 feet.

the north-west, and in a higher position (in level) to them, there are ruins of an ancient mill. From this mill there is an old aqueduct on which one can walk, which joins the fountain pool at the top or rim of the basin. At the place of juncture there are two holes through which originally the water must have flowed from the fountain into the now disused aqueduct.

4. My conclusion is that the traces of the channel above the monastery, and which were pointed out by Father Daond, are ruins of an old aqueduct for irrigating the "little plain" which lies between the fountain pool and the monastery.

\* \* \* \* \*

Between Tahghah and Khan Minyeh there is a rocky headland reaching down to the sea, and dividing the Gennesaret Plain from the "little plain." Following the line of the aqueduct that is visible in many places, especially near the monastery, we came to this headland through which there is a cutting made. *This is the highest point between the fountain pool and the Plain of Gennesaret.* Here Professor Knight took the level, and compared it with that of the fountain pool, the latter of which he found to be ten feet higher. The cutting is only in the highest point of the headland, and this made me conclude that it was made as an aqueduct to bring the water from the fountain pool to the Plain of Gennesaret for irrigation purposes.

In addition to what I have already said in Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, I now make the following remarks :—

5. Between the monastery and the cutting in the headland the ruins of the aqueduct are visible in many places.

6. The cutting was not made for the purpose of a road. It is too narrow. Two horsemen meeting in it could not pass each other.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> At the Ras-en-Nakura, between Acre and Tyre, there is a cutting in the cleft for the purpose of a road, but this is much wider than the one under discussion.

7. When the highest point is passed the rocks bear no trace of having been chiselled or cut, and are of too rough a nature for a road. For the purpose of an aqueduct it would not be necessary to cut or shape them, because there is a natural slope which would direct the flow of water downwards.

I therefore conclude that this traceable channel from the fountain pool to the Plain of Gennesaret was an aqueduct for purposes of irrigation; and that most probably *the fountain pool is the same as "the fountain which is called Capernaum" mentioned in Josephus* (chap. x. no. 8).

At the bottom of the headland there is the fountain called Ain-et-Tineh; which flows into the sea, and causes the ground west and south-west for some distance to be marshy and full of papyrus grass, oleanders, and other bushes. From this point commences the Plain of Gennesaret.

Two minutes' walk from the headland brought us to *Khan Minyeh*, which is also claimed by some as being the site of Capernaum. After spending some little time there we made our way to the shore, and re-entering our boat, sailed along, hugging the coast on account of the high wind that had now risen. Half an hour brought us to *Wad Erubadyeh* and opposite to *Ain-el-Mudawara*. Here we again landed and found that the amount of water coming down from the *Ain-el-Mudawara* was much less than that which flows out of the "fountain pool." Re-embarking, we in turn arrived opposite *Wady-el-Hamâm*, *el-Mijdel*, *Ain Bardi*, *Ain-el-Fûliyah*, and finally reached *Tiberias* about 4 p.m.

### *Part II.*

#### THE SITE OF CAPERNAUM.

For a long time there has been great dispute amongst scholars about the real site of Capernaum. The natives of the country in general seldom take an interest in the



identifying of Biblical sites, though they have special qualifications for so doing, living on the spots themselves and speaking the language (Arabic) that has for so many centuries been the common language of Palestine. For myself, I have long been interested in this subject, and have compiled a book for the Church Missionary Society's Schools on the Biblical geography of the country, hoping to create an interest in these matters among the people of the country.

In considering the subject of the site of Capernaum I shall divide it into four parts.

1. What we know about Capernaum from the New Testament.
2. What we know about it from Josephus.
3. What has been said on the subject by more modern writers.
4. My own conclusions.

#### I. NEW TESTAMENT PASSAGES REFERRING TO CAPERNAUM.

1. Christ visited and performed some miracles in it, before He made it "His own city" and dwelt there. (John ii. 12; Luke iv. 23.)

2. The nobleman came from Capernaum to ask Christ to heal his son. (John iv. 46.)

3. Christ made it his own city. (Matt. iv. 3; Mark i. 21; Luke iv. 31.)

4. After his first itineracy in Galilee (Mark i. 36-39) He came back to Capernaum. (Mark ii. 1-14.)

5. Christ came from Jerusalem to Capernaum after the second Passover. (Luke vii. 1-10.)

6. After the second itineracy (Luke viii. 1-3) He returned to it. (Matt. xiii. 1, 3; Luke viii. 4.)

7. Christ went to the East of the Lake to the country of Gerasenes (Luke viii. 22), and returned to Capernaum. Matt. ix. 1.

8. Third itineracy (Mark vi. 1-6). Return to Capernaum. (Mark vi. 30.)

9. Christ went with his disciples to the other side of the Lake (John vi. 1), and withdrew apart (Luke ix. 10) "into a desert place" (R.V. to a city called *Bethsaida*, ? *Julias*), where He fed the 5,000. After this, when even was come (Matt. xiv. 23), He constrained his disciples to enter into a boat, and go before Him to the other side to *Bethsaida* (Mark vi. 45). They "were going over the sea to *Capernaum*" (John vi. 17) and "in the fourth watch of the night" (Matt. xiv. 25), having rowed about five and twenty furlongs" (about four miles) Christ came to them walking upon the sea (John vi. 19). Now "when they had crossed over, they came to the land *unto Gennesaret*, and moored to the shore" (Mark vi. 53), and the men of that place knew Him (Matt. xiv. 35). On the morrow the multitudes entered boats, and came to *Capernaum* seeking Jesus, whom they found on the other side of the sea (John vi. 22-25).

10. Fourth itineracy (Matt. xv. 21), and after feeding the 4,000 (Matt. xv. 32) He came into the borders of Magadan (Magdala, Matt. xv. 39), or "unto the parts of Dalmanutha (Matt. viii. 10). Then "entering into the boat He departed to the other side"—that is to *Bethsaida* (*Julias*)—and then went forth into the villages of *Cæsarea Philippi* (Mark viii. 13, 22, 27).

11. He came back to *Capernaum* (Matt. xvi. 24, 25), but did not remain long there. Then He left Galilee altogether (Matt. xix. 1).

12. Christ pronounced woe against Capernaum. (Matt. xi. 20 ; Luke x. 13-15.)

## II. TELL HUM.

I myself feel that this site is the most probable one.

## ANSWERS TO SOME OBJECTIONS.

*Objection 1.*

That although there is a tradition in favour of it yet this cannot be depended on, as Christian tradition has erred in regard to other sites, i.e. Sychar (*Hist. Geog. of Holy Land*, G. Adam Smith, p. 456 note).

The same might be said of the tradition that Khan Minyeh is the site of Capernaum. It proves as much, or as little, for both places. But the tradition for Tell Hum is of older date.

*Objection 2.*

Some deny that it was on the main road. But Dr. G. A. Smith says that "it is on the great road." Supposing it was not on a main road, and was not suitable for a customs city, I ask :

1. Is it certain that all the great cities were on the main roads? Josephus calls Capernaum a village.

2. Is it certain that there were no custom houses except on the main road? Why should it not be a custom-house for the taxing of fish, and boating on the Lake?

3. It is not plainly said that Matthew was at Capernaum when Christ called him, but rather it appears from Mark ii. 13, 14 that after healing the paralytic in Capernaum Christ "went forth again by the seaside." It is possible that this place was near Khan Minyeh, or any other spot on the seashore or main road. But the ruins that are pointed out near Khan Minyeh are some distance from the shore of the Lake, while those of Tell Hum are on the shore.

*Objection 3.*

It is said that Capernaum was on the Plain of Gennesaret. How do we know that Capernaum was on the Plain of Gennesaret? Canon Tristram says (*Bible Places*, p. 280): "Its distance from the Round Fountain and from

the Plain of Gennesareth seems the obstacle to a decisive admission of its being the city of the gospels."

Perhaps this idea was built on the saying in John vi. 17, "And they were going to Capernaum," and Mark vi. 35 confusing Capernaum with Gennesaret, and on John vi. 22-25. It may be said that the disciples were going to Capernaum, and arrived at Gennesaret. Then Capernaum must be in the Plain of Gennesaret. This is the argument.

Also those who came to seek Jesus found Him in Capernaum, while He had arrived at Gennesaret. Then again Capernaum was in Gennesaret.

*Answer to this.*

1. The Lord compelled his disciples to go before to Bethsaida (west), Luke ix. 10, but we see that they were going to Capernaum (John xi. 17). Ought they not to have been going to Bethsaida? (probably Bethsaida = Tahghah). But on account of the dangers of the storm on the sea they started from the eastern shore about evening (Matt. xiv. 23), at the fourth watch of the night they were not farther off the eastern shore than four miles (Matt. xiv. 25). We should naturally expect to find them obeying their Lord's command to go to Bethsaida. Why were they then going to Capernaum? The probable reason is that on account of the storm they determined to seek the nearest place of safety. Tell Hum is nearer than Khan Minyeh and is the nearest inhabited place from the point where the Jordan enters the Lake.

2. When our Lord entered the boat and the storm ceased, they were not obliged to go to the nearest place on the western shore. No doubt there must have been a sufficient reason for the Lord's change of plan in now going to Gennesaret.

3. If Capernaum was in the Plain of Gennesaret, it would

have been said about those who came to Capernaum seeking Jesus that they "found Him there," or merely that they "found Him." But it is said that they found Him "on the other side" (John vi. 26). There was no need for this addition unless we suppose that they did not find Him at Capernaum. But they reached Capernaum, and when they found Him not, they went to the Plain of Gennesaret and found Him there.

4. If the Lord had arrived at Capernaum, there had been no need for saying (Matt. xiv. 35), "When the men of that place knew Him." Is not this saying superfluous if "that place" was Capernaum—his own city? But the objection will disappear if we suppose that He had arrived at a place other than Capernaum, where He was known, but not so well known as at Capernaum.

#### *Objection 4.*

It is said that there is no "Tell" at Tell Hum (see Dr. G. A. Smith, *Hist. Geog.*, p. 456, note).

*Answer.* I do not understand what the objectors mean by the word "Tell." In Arabic the word "tell" is used for any heap of ruins or mound. So that the ruins of Tell Hum themselves are to-day a "tell."

#### *Objection 5.*

It is said that "*Tell Hum*" is derived from *Tan hum*, the name of a Jewish Rabbi buried here (see Dr. G. A. Smith, p. 456, note).

At first sight this appears reasonable; but when we remember how many mistakes have occurred in settling the derivations of such names it is possible after all that this is a mistake. For example (1) *Abu Shoosheh*, where the Palestine Exploration Society is working to-day, is now without doubt identified as the site of old *Gezer*. At this place there is a wely called اطرايرلي The inhabitants of



the present village say that the wely is named after that part of North Africa called Algerira اطزائر Al-gezair, while we now know that it is named after Gezer.

(2) The same thing can be said about هوشة near Shefa Amr. It is the Asheh of the Talmud. The inhabitants say that it is derived from the name of a man who ran هاشش furiously after some enemies who were attacking the village and was killed.

#### *Objection 6—*

That there is no water at Tell Hum (Dr. G. A. Smith, p. 456). I do not understand how Dr. G. A. Smith and others gather that Josephus means that the fountain called Capernaum is *in Capernaum*. All he says is “the people of the country call it Capharnaum.” This may mean that the fountain was called Capernaum because it was near the city, but how near is not implied.

The fountain pool above described is less than two miles distance from Tell Hum, and might well have been called Capernaum after the city of that name.

#### *Instances of this custom.*

1. عيون صغوري The springs of Sepphoris.
2. حغاير دبوري The pits (fountain pits) of Dabûrieh (the “Daberath” of the Bible, Josh. xix. 12).
3. بئر طبعون Beer Tab'aun (on north-west of Plain of Jezreel).
4. نهر بيروت Nahr Beirout (river of Beyrout).

These fountains, in common with others in Palestine, are to-day named after their several cities or villages, although they are about the same distance from them as Tell Hum is from the fountain pool.

## FINAL CONCLUSION.

*The ruins that are at Tell Hum.*

Canon Tristram says (*Bible Places*, p. 280): "At least it seems tolerably certain that whether this is the Capernaum of our Lord's time or not, it is the Capernaum of the Jews when, under Hadrian, they were permitted to return to their land."

Can we not go back a little, and say that it seems tolerably certain that the ruins of Tell Hum are those of a city existing in our Lord's time?

On February 13, 1906, I was in Mujudel (a village about three miles from Nazareth), and was guest of a man who is well known as a discoverer of ancient glass. He told me that the best glass that he had found was at Tell Hum. He had also discovered lead coffins, that had afterwards been melted down and sold. He had found about fifty pieces of thin gold plate about the size of the palm of the hand. All these were found in that part of Tell Hum which belongs to عرب السليّة (Arabs of Es-Simakeyeh). The boundary between this portion of ground, and that of the Latin monastery, is near the north-east of the wall of the monastery garden.

I asked him if he had found any ancient glass at Khan Minyeh. He replied, "None: and even Father Daond told us that if we found any antiquities he would give us a present. We did our best to find some at the Khan and above it, but were unsuccessful?"

Does not this finding of ancient glass at Tell Hum, together with the importance of the existing ancient ruins, prove that there was a city here in the time of our Lord?

There remains one point more. If there was a city here in our Lord's time, it seems to me that there can be no doubt that this is the site of old Capernaum. For in addition

to what has already been said about the disciples seeking, at the time of the storm on the Lake, to reach the nearest harbour, or shelter, (see under objection 3,) we have the incident related of Josephus, after he had fallen from his horse, that he was "carried into a village named Capharnome, or Capernaum" (*Life*, 72). Where was he when he fell from his horse? Was he not near Julias, that is near the point where the Jordan enters the Lake? Would he not have been brought to the nearest inhabited place on the west of the Jordan? Now the city that existed in his day at the present site of Tell Hum would be the nearest "village" to the mouth of the Jordan. And therefore the ruins of Tell Hum are on the site of the old Capernaum.

ASAD MANSUR.

*April 3, 1906.*

Nazareth, Palestine.

*SOME NOTES ON CHRISTIAN DIOSCURISM.*

*The Dioscuri in the Christian Legends : The Cult of the Heavenly Twins.* By J. Rendel Harris, D.Litt. Cambridge University Press.

THE subject of the survival of heathen custom and myth in Christianity is intensely interesting, and forces itself upon the observer at every turn. To expound it completely would demand a cross between Scaliger and Methuselah ; but Dr. Harris's published labours in one corner of this vast field, while a sign of the immensity of the task, are a proof of his learning, diligence, and acumen, as well as an inspiration and example to others who shall follow in his steps. He has taken as his province the annexation of Dioscurism by the Church ; and, though we are led to hope for much more on this point from his pen, the two works named above are full of suggestion, and crowded with fact and ingenious conjecture.

It is not our part to criticize Dr. Harris, but to learn from him with the humility that is optimistically ascribed to pupils. We have not indeed—nor would he desire it—always agreed with him ; but we shall not linger here on our disagreements or on the grounds of them. It is our object, in a series of tentative and disconnected notes, to add our tiny quota to Dr. Harris's collection. Some of our additions will be from Norse and Old English sources ; and, if we are correct in them, this may well be an advantage ; for Germanic legend differs so widely *in tone* from Hellenic or Italic, that any material harmony seems to point to a *primary* unity, and will justify Dr. Harris in seeking his explanations deep down in unsophisticated human nature.

Later published than the *Dioscuroi, The Cult of the Heavenly Twins* is logically the earlier, and traces Dioscuric worship to more primitive beginnings. Dr. Harris starts by pointing out the fact that in early stages of human development the birth of twins is a portent to be received with dread. Unlike Virgil, to whom a "simillima proles, indiscreta suis," was a "gratus parentibus error" (*Aeneid*, 10, 392), Dr. Harris has learnt that such a birth is the very reverse of a pleasure to the parents. We can illustrate this from Northern sagas.

In the story of Geirmund Hell-skin (*Sturlunga Saga*, ed. Vigfusson and Powell, i. 1) we learn that Geirmund and Hámund were the twin sons of King Hjor and his queen; but, we are told, so dark was the skin of both that the queen took a dislike to them, and exchanged them for the fair son of one of her handmaids. It is no unlikely conjecture that the queen's hatred of her children was really due, not to their dusky colour, but to the mere fact that they were twins. As in the case of Romulus and Remus, mentioned by Dr. Harris (*Cult of the Heavenly Twins*, p. 23), the Saga-man, ignorant of the uncanniness of twinship, invents a new reason for their expulsion from the royal house.

A second point of interest is the similarity of the names given to twins (*Cult*, p. 66 and *passim*; *Dioscuroi*, p. 42). Here again Germanic legend supplies illustrative examples. We have already mentioned Geirmund and Hámund, a sufficient parallel to Speusippus and Mesippus. Modern criticism inclines to accept the historical reality of Hengest and Horsa; whether this is just or not, their joint leadership unites with their practical identity of name to induce us to put them down as twins. To Menja and Fenja, the two giant maidens who ground the mills of King Fródi (*Grotta Songr, Corpus Poeticum Boreale*, i. 184 seq.), twin-



ship is nowhere directly ascribed, but it can be inferred with tolerable certainty. "We were playmates, brought up under the earth for nine winters": i.e. as giantesses they required nine years of gestation in the womb of earth, in place of the ordinary nine months, as Loki (*Lokasenna*, 92, C.P.B. i. 104) was eight years under the earth as a female producing his monstrous brood. As to their Dioscuric character, it is obvious. Welcomed by King Fródi, they grind him benefits; tyrannized over by him, they grind him ruin; a well known characteristic of the Heavenly Twins everywhere. Nor are they less similar to the Great Brethren in their warlike doings; in fact, they give us a picture of another Lake Regillus: "Thereafter in Sweden we stepped into the battle-storm; we brake the byrnies, we shivered the shields; we went to meet the gray-clad warriors; we pulled down one king and set up another; we gave help to good Gutthorm and rested not till Knui fell."

It would be easy to multiply twin *names* from the Edda: Hrist and Mist, Randgrith and Radgrith, the Valkyries (*Grimniss Mál*); the serpents Goin and Moin (*ibid.*); and innumerable others; but the proof of actual personal twinship would be difficult. In the case of the dwarfs, to which we shall recur in a moment, the names are peculiarly suggestive; but, as is so often seen in Northern mythology, etymological and allegorical considerations have played their part. We hear (*Voluspá*) of Vitir and Litir, Fili and Kili, Fialarr and Galarr, Skirvir and Virvir, Anar and Onar, Finnir and Ginnir, Bivavr and Bavavr, Dvalinn and Durinn. Some of these unquestionably seem to point to Dioscurism; but Nár and Náinn (both meaning *corpse*), Thrár and Thráinn (probably *obstinate* or *rotten*), seem to be merely etymological. Passing by these for an instant, we are confronted (*Hervarar Saga*, 2) with a case in which there

is no doubt, that of the "tveir Haddingjar" or two Haddings. They were the youngest of the twelve sons of Arngrim: "they did between them the work of one man, because they were twins and the youngest," whereas Angantyr, the eldest, did the work of two. It is not unworthy of mention that among Arngrim's other sons are Hervardh and Hjorvardh; and in the same Saga Angantyr's daughter Hervor appears as a virago, taking the name Hervardh when doing her deeds with the magic sword Tyrfin. And here we may incidentally notice a further point or two. The sons of Arngrim were Berserks; hence we are not surprised to find that the two Berserks who, in spite of their giant size and great strength, came to such grief before Thorvald Víðforli (*Kristni Saga*, 2) were both called Hawk. We might perhaps ascribe some of the extraordinary deeds of the Berserks to an infusion of older Dioscuric legend into tales of demoniac possession and of remarkable deeds of bravery or strength. Nor must we forget to notice that the sons of Arngrim are twelve in number—a common feature in Berserk stories, and an instructive parallel to the story of Jacob. Not only were the sons of Westmarr, referred to by Dr. Harris (*Cult*, p. 58), twelve in number (including a triplet of Greps), but the Berserk companions of Thorir and Ospak in *Grettis Saga* were also twelve. In the prose Edda (*Skaldskaparmál*, 43) we read of King Hrolf Kráki and his twelve Berserks, among whom are the *brothers* (twins?) Svipdag and Beigudh: and the tradition survives in the twelve Paladins of Charlemagne. Hence the twin Haddings among the twelve sons of Arngrim may represent an obscure reminiscence of the Gemini among the signs of the zodiac, in which Castor and Pollux, of course, found an early place. The fact that King Volsung (*Volsunga Saga*, 2) had ten sons only, may go back to a ten-month year—a point on which Dr. Harris has a few words to say—but here

again the youngest, Sigmund, was twin to his sister Signy : and here again we note the similarity of name (cp. *Cult*, p. 45). Observe also that, as we learn from *Beowulf* (line 875 seq.), Sigmund is the original hero of the great Volsung epic, having only later been displaced by his son Sigurd (Siegfried). Among the many elements that have gone to make up that wonderful story, this of Dioscurism can hardly be omitted from consideration. For example, may not the wanderings of Sigmund as a werwolf (*Vols. Saga*, 8) be due to a belated memory of the expulsion of at least one of a pair of twins from the house ? (cp. *Cult*, ch. ii.). Among the many ideas underlying werwolves, that of outcast is not the least important ; and we may here compare the well known story of Valentine and Orson. Again, Sigmund's fight with the dragon may be placed alongside of the story of Sisinnius and Sisinnodorus (*Cult*, p. 84), or of the feats of St. Michael. Remembering the keen eyes of Lynceus, we may recall how Sigurd's (i.e. originally Sigmund's) *bright eyes* were too piercing for Gutthorm, who dared not kill him till they closed in sleep (*Vols. Saga*, 30). Once more, the death of Sigmund at the hands of Odin signifies his choice as one of the Einherjar or immortal warriors, and is the nearest approach to *stellification* that the somewhat prosy Northern mythology allows. After being thus chosen, Sigmund becomes a special watcher over battle. But we must not dwell longer on this point.

Dr. Harris (*Cult*, p. 58) notices how frequently twins with the same name, requiring some discrimination, receive a distinguishing cognomen. Thus, as he reminds us, Harald's twin sons were known as Halfdan the White and Halfdan the Black. Other instances might be given. For example, Olaf the Peacock (*Laxdaela Saga*, 24 : ed. Kölund, p. 83) had two servants, brothers, one called Ann the White and

the other Ann the Black. These are not directly called twins, but we can hardly doubt that they were so, when we find their brother Beinir mentioned apart. A similar reason makes us suspect that Otkell and Hallkell in *Njals Saga*, (cap. 47) were twins. A further example we had ourselves independently observed; and though we find that Dr. Harris has himself inserted it (*Cult*, p. 59), yet, as we do not think he has made the most of it for his own purposes, we shall refer to it here. In Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*, (Book V. cap. 10), we read of two saints, *both called Hewald*, but distinguished as Hewald the White and Hewald the Black. Both were martyred among the old Saxons (A.D. 695); but, as the sword of Pallas gave "dura discrimina" to the twins ThyMBER and Larides (*Aeneid*, 10. 395), so they met distinction in death, one being slain with the steel, the other horribly tortured. That they were twins is sufficiently obvious. But let us see what miracles they performed after death. "A great ray of light, reaching up to heaven, shone every night over the place, whatever it might be, to which they had arrived, and this in the sight of the heathen that had slain them, Moreover, one of them appeared in a vision by night to one of his companions, whose name was Tilmon, acquainting him that he should find their bodies in that place where he should see rays of light reaching from heaven to earth; which happened accordingly. Their bodies, being found, were interred with the honour due to martyrs." It needs no great acumen to perceive that in these two Hewalds we have yet another case of the transference of Dioscuri from heathenism to the Church; and we are not surprised to hear that "a stream gushed out of the place where they were killed, which to this day affords abundance of water." But it is possible to trace their ancestry still more closely. Turning to Grimm's *Deutsche Mythologie* (Eng. ed. by Stallybrass, p. 454), we find that



the dwarfs, many of whom we have already suspected to be twins, are called in the Edda (*Grimnismál* 43, *Skaldskaparmál* 35) the *sons of Iwald*, and build ships or weave gold. Passing on a few pages in Grimm, we learn that many Dioscuric functions are performed by the elves (whose identity with the dwarfs hardly needs proof, *Grimm*, p. 457). They assist the dwarfs in labour; they settle disputes; they requite favours by bringing luck to their benefactors. Finally, when we see that the two Hewalds are buried at *Cologne*, after a journey in which miraculous rays of light guide the whole way, we can hardly help associating them with the more famous triplet Balthasar, Melchior, and Caspar, whose relation to the Dioscuri is not far to seek. (Note also that the name *Ann* is that of a dwarf: *Voluspá*, 11, 5, his double is *Onar*: hence it seems as if, at least occasionally, twins were named after dwarfs.)

Dr. Harris tells us much, and we hope for more, tending to prove that St. Michael himself is a Dioscure (*Cult*, p. 131 seq.). When he discusses the question further, we shall hope for light on the curious story told by Aelfric in his Homilies (ed. Thorpe, i. 502 seq.), and in the O. E. Martyrology (May 8), derived from some source which he has doubtless traced, of the origin of Michael-worship. "From Mount Garganus originated the festival of Michaelmas. There dwelt a wealthy man named Garganus. It happened that when the immense multitude of his cattle was grazing on the mountain, an unruly bull wandered alone, and despised the herd. He sought the bull everywhere, and at last found him at the entrance of a cavern. He was angry, and bent his bow, intending to shoot the bull with a poisoned arrow; but the poisoned arrow turned back and instantly slew him who had shot it. After a time, the archangel Michael appeared to the Bishop in a ghostly vision, saying,



Know that the shooting of the man with his own arrow was done by my will. I especially love the place which the bull defended, and I would by that sign manifest that I am the guardian of the place." Then follows the sudden appearance of the Church of St. Michael in that place, and a description of the repulse of invaders in almost every detail similar to that of the defeat of Brennus at Delphi; nay, we hear of the impression of the archangel's footsteps near the door of the church. That we have here a Dioscurophany is obvious. Garganus was at one time renowned for its oaks (*Hor. Od.* ii. 9) and for its aromatic plants (4. 2): and it is needless to point out that by its position it would be a suitable abode for the guardians of sailors.

Have we not here a plain metamorphosis of a temple of Castor and Pollux into a church of St. Michael? And may not the bull, defending their abode, be a reflection of the close relation of Taurus and Gemini among the signs of the zodiac? The fatal arrow has its parallel in the darts of Apollo and Artemis. Yet as a rule Michael is the successor of Hermes.

But it is when we come to Dr. Harris's chapters on St. Thomas that we are most interested. He deals with the Thomas legend in full. According to the Edessan *Acta Thomae*, the real name of Thomas was Judas, and his cognomen denoted twinship *to our Lord*. Strange stories are told of the confusion due to his extraordinary likeness to Christ; and in these Dr. Harris makes it plain that we have a transference of Edessan Dioscurism into the hagiology of the Church. Now here we have to make the interesting point that this legend, in a form, perhaps, independent of the Edessan, was early known in our own country. The old English version of the Gospels, in John xx. 24, gives the following: "Thomas, án of thám twelfon, the is gecweden

Didimus, that is gelicost on úregethéode, hene waes mid him ” — “ Thomas, one of the twelve, who is called Didymus, *that is in our language very like.* ” And again, in John xxi. 2, we find, “ Thomas the is gecweden gelicost. ” It might seem that this strange gloss was derived from the story of Thomas as given in the Old English Martyrology ; a story unquestionably borrowed (though probably not through Isidore of Seville) from the Eastern legend. At any rate, the Martyrology simply translates the *Passio Sancti Thomae*, which itself gives the Edessan tale with sufficient accuracy to show its derivation. But its opening words are as follows : “ On thone án and twentegthan daeg thaes monthes bith sancte Thomas týd thaes apostoles, se waes on Grecisc nemned didimus and on Romanisc geminus, thaet is on úre gethéode getwyn. Forthám hé waes swá geciged forthám he waes úrum haélende gelíc on menniscra onsýne ” : “ On the 21st of this month (December) is the day of St. Thomas the Apostle, who was called in Greek Didymus, and in Latin geminus, that is in our language Twin. He was so called because he was, in bodily appearance, like our Saviour. ”

Considering this passage, we see that it is unlikely that the author of the O. E. Version can have borrowed, at least directly, from it. Not to press the change of *gelíc* into *gelicost*, it is hard to believe that with *geminus* before him both in his Martyrology and in his Latin copy, he would have omitted to translate it *getwyn*, even if he had decided to add a gloss “ very like. ” Also, he would unquestionably have added “ úrum Haélende, ” (our Saviour) ; for *gelicost* by itself is unintelligible without a limitation. It is not possible to assume that words have fallen out in the English version ; for in *both* passages, xx. 24 and xxi. 2, the same phrase occurs.

Again, if the translator was adding out of his own head, he would surely have added his gloss where Thomas is first mentioned, namely, John xi. 16; but there he omits alike the twinship and the resemblance, apparently not finding *didimus* in his Latin copy. We are thus shut up to the conclusion that in the Latin from which the O. E. Version was made, there was the phrase, "Thomas, qui dicitur Didymus, id est in nostra lingua simillimus." But where did this gloss come from? On independent grounds it is suspected that the form of the Vulgate on which the O. E. Version was based, was largely influenced by the old Latin, as used by the Irish missionaries of the North. As Berger (quoted by Bright in his edition of the O. E. Gospels) remarks, "Le mélange des traditions religieuses est resté longtemps la loi des provinces du nord d'Angleterre et plus encore des pays celtiques. Il est donc tout naturel qu'une partie des meilleurs manuscrits du type irlandais proviennent de Mercie ou de Northumbrie, et ces manuscrits sont des textes mêlés, c'est-à-dire des Vulgates remplies d'interpolations irlandaises." It is true that the O. E. version of John is less "Irish" than that of the Synoptics; but it remains probable that it is in an "Irish" Vulgate that a "simillimus" passage is to be sought. As Professor Bright adds, it is not unlikely that the very MSS. used by our translators may be found; if so, we shall look with interest to see if our conclusion is correct. But in any case it is interesting to find that the tradition was familiar in England about 850 (the date assigned by Herzfeld to the O. E. Martyrology), and continued at least till the beginning of the eleventh century (the date of our O. E. Gospels). It is curious that it seems to have been unknown to Cynewulf, whose *Fata Apostolorum* (Grein-Wülker, ii. 89) merely tells us of the Apostle's Indian journeys; of his raising a

king's brother, named Gad, to life ; and of his martyrdom by the sword. Aelfric's homilies also practically disregard St. Thomas. There is, however, no limit to the possibility of discovery in this field.

E. E. KELLETT.

## ST. PAUL'S GOSPEL : AN EIRENICON.<sup>1</sup>

AMERICA should make much of Dr. Du Bose. I strongly suspect that in his own proper field—which I might perhaps describe as the Philosophy of the Christian Religion—he is the wisest writer on the other side of the Atlantic ; indeed it may not be too much to say, the wisest Anglican writer (with so French-looking a name it seems wrong to speak of Anglo-Saxon, and it narrows the ground a little to confine it to a single communion) on both sides of the Atlantic.

America should make much of him—and by this I mean, not so much praise and honour him (America is sure to do that to any one who is worthy !) as utilize and assimilate his work and thought for its own advantage. It should do this just because there are features about him that are not in the narrower sense American. He might be described as an encouraging example of what one American type may come to ; but this particular type is, I imagine, not at present largely developed, and therefore it is all the more valuable. It differs a good deal from the type or types with which we are most familiar.

First and foremost—and indeed perhaps everything in a word—here is an American who is not in a hurry, as he might himself say, “tremendously not” in a hurry ! Not that I am going to blame the American hurry ; it is natural enough and right enough, for a nation situated as they

<sup>1</sup> *The Gospel according to St. Paul.* By W. P. Du Bose, M.A., S.T.D. Longmans, 1907.



are. They have a big continent to subdue; and they feel its promise; and it is not strange that they should also feel that no time is to be lost in subduing it. That feverish energy is accomplishing, and will accomplish, great things.

But something more is wanted for a nation really to possess its soul. That something is wisdom; and wisdom cannot be had without calm. And therefore it is that it seems to me that America must specially prize this quality of calm; all the more where, as in the case of Dr. Du Bose, it is calm of the right kind—active and not passive, a quiet self-contained and self-controlled creativeness, that hastes not and rests not, like the great Creator Himself.

This quality is impressed upon the opening chapter, and so strikes the key-note of the whole book. We feel at once that we have to do with a large outlook upon the world and upon the ways of God with men—an outlook large, considerate, and intrepid, strong and yet dutiful, untroubled and unshaken by anxieties either without or within.

The ultimate aim of each one of us should be not to save ourselves from error, but to advance the truth. We may safely rely upon it that our truth will in the end be accepted and our error corrected. . . . I hold what I hold subject to the revision and correction of the deeper truth of the Scriptures and the larger wisdom of the Church. . . . There are those who object to our making salvation, the life of the spirit, the life of religion in general, too natural a process. We cannot kick against the pricks, the world has begun to make the discovery, and it will not go backward in it, that the natural is God's way. The natural is the rational and the divine. . . . These are times—but, let us remember, not more so than were the earliest and most living ages of Christianity—of thought and speculation, original and independent thought and speculation, upon the truth as it is in Jesus Christ. They are not times of unthinking and unquestioning acceptance of foregone and foreclosed inquiry and investigation. The fact may be condemned and lamented, but no amount of shutting our own or others' eyes and ears to it will make it any the less a fact. . . . The position

here taken is, to my mind, independent of any present or future conclusions of scepticism or criticism with regard either to the Scriptures or the Church. I fully recognize not only the function, but the necessity of both scepticism and criticism, in their true meaning and use ; and I presume neither to limit nor to define these. But the fact will always remain that we receive our Christianity through the Scriptures and the Church, and that these are the tribunal of final resort for determining what Christianity is. (pp. 3, 4, 8, 9, 11, 14.)

No doubt there is at the present time in many quarters a disposition to go beyond this, not so much to appeal to the Scriptures as to sit in judgement on them, and to ignore the mind of the Church. That is very largely the attitude of critical schools on the Continent of Europe. But I think we may be thankful that Dr. Du Bose draws the line where he does ; it is certainly not either narrow or illiberal.

## I.

Most of my readers will be aware that the volume now before me and of which I am to give some account is practically the continuation of another published about a year ago under the title *The Gospel in the Gospels*. I had the privilege of reviewing this earlier work in the EXPOSITOR for May, 1906, and I will not repeat what I there said. Just as the earlier volume aimed at giving in a connected form the essential meaning of the Gospels, so the present volume aims at giving in like manner a connected view of the leading or root-ideas of St. Paul. It is substantially a commentary on the first eight chapters of the Epistle to the Romans ; not a commentary of a formal kind with detailed notes on each verse, but rather a series of essays upon the epistle taken section by section, and trying to bring out broadly what is most central and permanent in the contents of each. I do not think that we have anything quite like it in English ; and yet it is just what most

of us, or at least those of us who are general readers, would wish to do for ourselves ; the professed student needs to study his text closely word by word, but the general reader prefers to hold his text as it were at arm's length and to see the leading thought in it stand out in clear relief. It is just in this way that Dr. Du Bose seeks to help him ; what he gives is practically a succession of bird's-eye views of the paragraphs and divisions into which the text of the epistle naturally falls.

I do not think we can be surprised that Dr. Du Bose should make his discussions revolve round the Epistle to the Romans in this way. It certainly is a complete and coherent presentation of the fundamental ideas of the Apostle's teaching ; and it adequately represents and summarizes the main points in the two earlier groups of epistles ; it also no doubt made the whole task easier, to be able to follow the outline of a single continuous argument. And yet perhaps this procedure is open to the criticism that it does not quite take in the whole of the Gospel according to St. Paul. The later epistles bring out some sides of it—more especially that side which presents the closest parallel to the Logos doctrine in St. John and the relation of Christ to the Church—which are but slightly touched upon in the Epistle to the Romans and therefore practically fall out of Dr. Du Bose's purview. Perhaps it may be said that these are not strictly parts of "the Gospel," but rather corollaries or developments of it. The Gospel is primarily the glad tidings of salvation ; and the whole groundwork of salvation is fully and searchingly treated.

In my previous review I had occasion to point out the great completeness and coherence of Dr. Du Bose's teaching. It is no mere aggregation of loosely related doctrines but essentially a system, and a system well knit in its parts and carefully rounded off as a whole.

And another remarkable thing that I had to point out was the close resemblance which this system presents to that which we in England associate with the name of Dr. Moberly. As we were fated to lose the one writer before his time, our satisfaction is all the greater that the other should survive to continue his work ; for *The Gospel according to St. Paul* not only takes up the *The Gospel in the Gospels*, but also, if it does not exactly take up, at least reviews and to a great extent goes over the same ground as *Atonement and Personality*. It might be said to be a restatement, with characteristic difference of language and independence of thought, of the teaching of that book.

Perhaps one's first thought is that the new book does not add much of quite fundamental importance to the old. The root-ideas of both books are the same. We might at first sight suppose that the later work was only the arrival of a strong reinforcement in aid of the earlier, the appearance on the field of a weighty champion of the same cause. But, when we come to look into it, we see that there is really more in the matter than this. The six years that have elapsed have not been in vain. It is, I think, true that no new factors are introduced in the treatment of the main problem. But at the same time the restatement is so careful and so searching and so balanced that it seems to me to constitute a real advance. I will venture to say even more than this. I cannot claim to have followed the recent literature of the leading subject involved very closely ; there may have been anticipation of which I am not aware ; but to me at least Dr. Du Bose's book seems to offer something very like the definitive solution of an age-long controversy. Just as the Gospel of St. Paul and the Epistle to the Romans has been the chief battle-ground of that controversy, so does what I conceive to be the satisfactory solution of the main question arising out of St. Paul's



Gospel, and his greatest Epistle seems to carry with it a virtual and sufficient settlement of the controversy that has gathered round them.

The reader will guess that I am referring to the vexed question that has agitated the Christian world in an acute form for nearly five centuries, the question that will perhaps be best understood if I call it by its old name, the doctrine of Justification by Faith.

It seems to me, if I am not mistaken, that Dr. Du Bose's statement of this doctrine, with perhaps one or two cautions added by way of explanation, furnishes the material for a more complete *eirenicon* than has hitherto been reached, and in particular for one that is more complete than was quite possible under the form in which the statement of the doctrine was left by Dr. Moberly.

I take upon myself to say this because I approach the doctrine from a different side—I might even say, from the opposite side—to both writers. They are close allies, and I am (so to speak), on this ground and within the limits of this particular subject, the enemy. But, if I am the enemy, I beg leave to say that I shall not only send out a flag of truce, but that I shall authorize my representative to conclude the terms of a permanent peace.

## II.

It will make the exposition of my meaning easier, if I may be forgiven a certain amount of apparent egotism, and if I may go back to an article of mine in the *EXPOSITOR* for May, 1901, reviewing Dr. Moberly's *Atonement and Personality*. In that article I tried (I am well aware how imperfectly) to state a case for a more old-fashioned view, and I pleaded that in the Christian Church alternative views should be regarded as tenable. In that, I confess, I



was altogether wrong. The two views are not alternatives that can be placed and tolerated side by side. I still think that there is an element of truth on the side that I was defending, just as I willingly and indeed eagerly acknowledged that there was a large element of truth on the side to which I was opposed. But the fact is that the opposing truths are not really *in pari materia* ; they are not truths than can be held side by side ; they belong rather to different spheres, and the reconciliation between them is to be effected, not by proposing the one as an alternative for the other, but by the careful delimitation of these different spheres.

Dr. Moberly and Dr. Du Bose are both primarily philosophers ; the position that the one maintained and that the other now repeats is essentially a philosophical position. In regard to this, and in regard to the ultimate truth of things, they are both absolutely right. So far as I took up ground against this, I evacuate that ground with all my forces, horse, foot and artillery. I knew that there was something wrong, when I wrote, but I did not see where the error lay. I believe that (with the help of Dr. Du Bose) I now do see this. The reservations that I really wish to make are of another kind, and come under other heads ; they do not belong to the region of philosophy, but in part to that of history, and still more to biblical exegesis and practical religion. In relation to the absolute truth of things, the truths that I desired to assert are subordinate, and can only be asserted as such. Dr. Du Bose, I am glad to say, sees this ; and he so states the truths that are dear to him as to leave room for those that are dear to me. For this I am sincerely grateful to him. If his ally had lived (alas, that he does not, if only to welcome such congenial aid !) I do not doubt that we should have come to terms along the same lines ; it is just the maturing and mellow-

ing, and in my case the clearing of the brain, that where the heart is right comes with time.

At this point I do not think that I can do better than try to set forth Dr. Du Bose's teaching as far as possible in his own words. When this has been done I will add a few remarks ; but in the meanwhile I will take the liberty of italicizing those parts of the statement that are especially welcome to me as keeping an opening for those supplemental truths that I contend for. In the case of single words the italics are the author's.

I have described the main issue as turning round the doctrine of Justification by Faith—of course, in the largest sense, with all that goes with it. I use this familiar phrase because it will probably best cover the ground and call up the history of the subject, with all those kindred issues and sub-issues that we associate with it. Dr. Du Bose does not use the phrase often ; indeed it may be said of him generally that he avoids hackneyed technicalities, with the best result for freshness and reality of presentation. The chapter of his book which corresponds most nearly to what we might call Justification by Faith is headed "The New Righteousness." The "New Righteousness" is naturally that teaching on the subject of righteousness, in relation at once to man and to God, which is most characteristic and distinctive of St. Paul and of the Epistle to the Romans. The asserting of the New Righteousness is based upon the break-down in actual fact of Old Righteousness, so far as that depended upon human efforts after the observance of law.

No man who knows what righteousness is, will come into God's presence with a claim of his own to it. . . . The Gospel of Jesus Christ was for sinners of every type save the impossible one of self-righteousness. This sense of being received, accepted, regarded, treated, as righteous is carried on from the mere negative statement under consideration to a positive form of it which gives a new and

important step in St. Paul's Gospel. It is this being *treated as* righteous, not on the ground of being righteous, but on the ground of a certain relation of faith to Christ's righteousness, upon which is laid the chief emphasis in St. Paul's system. (p. 71.)

Nothing can be more explicit, on a point where one is glad to see explicitness. Those who contend for the same ultimate conclusion as Dr. Du Bose have been too often tempted to evade the evidence which goes to show that St. Paul speaks of the sinner as "regarded or treated as righteous," and not made actually righteous. This is further illustrated by the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican.

The Pharisee who went up into the temple to pray and reminded God of his own righteousness was not thereby justified ; while the publican who afar off was conscious only of his own sin in the sight of God was, we are told, justified. That cannot mean either that he was recognized as actually being sinless, or that he was by act of God at the time made sinless, or righteous. The term "justify" is not in the parable of the Gospel used in the developed, almost technical, sense of the epistle before us, but *it is exactly on the line of it, and it illustrates the progress and the propriety of its later use. . . .* The publican is accepted on the ground of his, at the time, occupying the right posture or attitude, the only right attitude possible for him, towards righteousness and at the same time towards his own conscious unrighteousness. . . . It is the attitude which negatively towards our own unrighteousness we call *repentance*, and positively towards the righteousness of God we call *faith*. . . . The condition of possible or future righteousness is the right attitude or intention of mind and feeling towards actual present unrighteousness. . . . In the initial moment of contrition the only possible and the necessarily first right posture of the sinner is that consciousness of himself which could not be the beginning of hatred of his sin if it were not to the same extent the beginning of a love of holiness. . . . Righteousness in us cannot begin otherwise than as an incipient sense of sin and that *prolepsis* or pre-vision and apprehension of holiness which we call faith. Faith is therefore with a divine truth and propriety reckoned or imputed to us as being righteousness, for it is a necessary moment or stage in our righteousness. (pp. 72-74.)

It will be seen how fully Dr. Du Bose recognizes what there is of truth in the view opposed to his own. At the same time he safeguards his own view by laying stress upon

the end of process, which is not complete until the sinner becomes actually righteous.

It is the end always that determines the meaning and nature of the thing, and the Gospel is the power of God unto an actual righteousness of men ; and only by the way, or in a secondary sense, a gracious treating of sinful men, as not sinful, and of a faith which is not yet righteousness as being already such. . . . The Spirit of God, the holiness, righteousness, or life of God can do us no good save as they are our own, and they are our own only in our own possession and exercise of them. *It is an infinite initial blessing, a present Gospel, to us that God does not wait for us to be good, that He takes us to Himself from the moment of the birth in us of the will to be good, and by treating us as though we were makes us good.* But let us beware of stopping with the Gospel of being accepted and not going on to the real Gospel of being good. For there is no other real good for man than that of being good, of his own goodness. Any other is only a blessing on the way, a refreshment, and a help to the consummate end and blessedness of being what God is. And let us remember, too, what the goodness is that is our only real good. It is the spirit, nature, and life of God, it is love, service, and sacrifice. We have heard it said, I am content to be a sinner saved by grace. In the first place, in its truest and highest sense, to be a sinner saved is to be one who having been a sinner is so no longer ; to be content to be saved in and not from sin, to be saved and still a sinner, is no true contentment. . . . For one in that stage and attitude of faith and waiting, it is indeed a present though not the whole or highest blessedness of the Gospel that we are already, with God and in Faith, all that we shall be in God and in fact. *Indeed, in St. Paul's immediate crisis of thought and contention, this stage and phase of the matter is so uppermost for the time that he almost seems to treat it as the whole Gospel.* He never really does this, though his ardent and one-sided partisans have abundantly done so ever since. St. Paul has ever in his own mind the whole undismembered conception of salvation in Christ, but he is passionately in earnest in establishing the present gracious status of believers as already and completely in possession in faith, though not yet in fact, of all that God has made ours in Christ. (pp. 76, 78, 79.)

Dr. Du Bose is certainly not an "ardent and one-sided partisan," though he is really more "ardent" than his calm and deliberate language might lead us to suppose. I value especially the last sentence which I have italicized, because it does justice—and at last full justice—to the real



mind and purpose of St. Paul, which I cannot help thinking was a little twisted even by Dr. Moberly.

There is another phrase that I must italicize, because as between the joint position of Dr. Du Bose and Dr. Moberly and my own it is very important.

The response of the Gospel to the human sense of actual sin and unattainable holiness is *not the half-grace of forgiveness but the whole-grace of redemption and deliverance*. God manifests Himself in it, that is to say, in Jesus Christ, not as pitier and pardoner of man in his sin, but as redeemer and saviour of man from his sin. He is there seen, in all the completeness of justifying, sanctifying, and saving grace, as at once Righteous and righteousing or Rightouser. (p. 102.)

We note in passing that Dr. Du Bose sticks to his guns in regard to such coinages as "righteousing" and "immanental." Attention was called to these by several critics of the earlier book, especially on this side of the water. But I confess I think, with his second book before me, that its author is right in keeping the words and ignoring the criticism. He is right, I believe, doubly in these cases; at once because they come naturally to him—it is part of his idiosyncrasy to be rather fond of coining new words, and these particular words serve a real purpose in the expression of his thought—and also because they fill conveniently a vacant place in the English language. We want something to correspond not only to "transcendent" but to "transcendental," and we also want something which can be treated as the exact equivalent of the Greek *δικαιοῦν*, covering both the sense of "to account righteous" and "to make righteous."

The next pasasage that I shall quote illustrates, not perhaps quite favourably, one or two little turns of expression that are characteristic of the author's style—he is especially fond of the figure "zeugma," and I am not sure that there is not some slight risk of its becoming not



only a manner but a mannerism. However, it is of course not for this reason that I quote the paragraph, but because it will help to complete and explain the thought to which I have just referred.

John the Baptist's preaching and baptism contained everything that belongs to religion except, as he himself confessed, the power of it or the possibility of its realization. As has been more than once said, not only the primary condition, but the actual first step in religion, by which we mean the right relation of man to God, is the knowledge and sense or feeling of his own condition, his wants, and above all his own not only shortcomings or failures but transgressions and sins; and not only his sins but his sin. The prodigal felt not only that he had sinned, but that, deeper than that, he was a sinner. Everything depends upon man's own attitude towards sin and his own sin. That attitude we express by the word *repentance*. Applying again the principle that a thing is truly defined only by what it is in its completeness, I say that repentance means the putting away of sin. In the first place it means the actual putting it away, and in the second place it means the putting it away by the sinner himself. Any desire or any conferring of only pity or pardon is only, at the best, an imperfect or incomplete either repentance or remission. And in the second place, even God Himself can in the full sense confer the true remission or truly put away sin only as He can impart a true repentance or the inward disposition, power, and act of the man in himself putting away his sin. A real *aphesis* is neither if it is not both God's and the man's act. (p. 104 f.)

I will conclude the exposition of the train of thought which we have been so far following with the description, which really belongs to it and crowns it, of the state of peace into which the Christian enters.

The first immediate consequence of the blessedness made ours in Jesus Christ is the sense of *present peace*. It is necessary to make a distinction between this present peace and what we may term *real peace*,—if it be only for the purpose of taking in the gift of God in its entirety, its end as well as its beginning and progress. . . . To one who is ill and about to die it would bring great present peace to know that he was brought into possession of certain cure and so of assured recovery and health. But the real peace to the sick man is health itself, and the wonderful comfort and peace brought to him by a sure faith in it and a certain hope of it is, in a large measure at least, only proleptic or anticipatory. In a large measure,

but not wholly so. The patient may find in his very anticipation and hope a real beginning and progress of the return of actual health, and so his possession and enjoyment may be not all only future; and the believer not only looks forward in faith and hope to the actual fruition of God and holiness and life, but has an ever increasing foretaste of them now. That, too, is real peace so far as it goes, and is to be classed, in theological language, rather with the real peace of sanctification and final glorification than with the immediate present peace of justification. . . . If the worst sinner at this moment in the world could be brought to an immediate spiritual apprehension of the full meaning of Christian baptism, what it is that is made all ours by that divine instrument, assuredly that act of spiritual apprehension on his part would be the first tremendous step in the process of real righteousness, or sanctification, on his actual way to God. But of real righteousness, or righteousness of his own, how little would it be! Of real reception or reception by actual participation there could indeed be but a drop from the infinite ocean; but, on the other hand, by the reception of faith and hope, or of anticipatory appropriation, it can be all his in a moment. *He may in one ecstatic sweep of vision behold all God become human, his own, righteousness and life.* In that one happy moment, or in the longer happy moment, of his whole earthly life of faith and hope, it is not his own paltry attainment of personal righteousness or life with which God credits him. Rather it is all that his faith takes in and appropriates to itself of the infinite and eternal righteousness of God Himself. All of Jesus Christ, who is God's promise and gift to us of His own divine righteousness,—all of Jesus Christ, who is consequently also our own perfect actual participation in the righteousness of God—is reckoned, accounted or imputed to, is as it were put to the credit, of the worst sinner who by a true faith accepts and appropriates Him to himself. (pp. 129-131.)

In the latter part of this last paragraph new thoughts come up, about which more will be said later. But in the meantime, what a noble outburst in the midst of all this severe reasoning, in that "one ecstatic sweep of vision"! It is a grand expression of that complementary truth for which I would plead.

### III.

When all concessions are made—and in the passages I have quoted there is much that, if not exactly put forward as concession, is at least qualifying truth—it will still be

seen that Dr. Du Bose, like Dr. Moberly before him, is rigorous and uncompromising enough. Not many pages are allowed to pass anywhere in the volume without some reminder that the only righteousness in which it is possible really to rest is the man's own actual righteousness, not imputed but imparted, and realized in himself. It is to me a marvel what multitudinous ways are found of saying this one thing in different words. I should have thought the iteration almost excessive ; but I can understand the wish to drive home this point, in view of the extent to which a laxer theory has prevailed.

Both with Dr. Du Bose and with Dr. Moberly the whole weight of character, temperament and intellectual leaning told in the same direction. In both writers there was and is an innate veracity that is intolerant of any form of fiction. In both writers there was and is an intense moral earnestness that could not be trifled with. Both writers manifest a keen sensitiveness to the currents of modern thought, especially those that are often directed against Christianity. And lastly, both writers are philosophers, in quest of a complete moral theory of the universe, and unable to acquiesce in anything less.

And yet there is another point of view ; and, whatever condemnation I may bring down upon myself by the confession, I must confess that I have shared in it myself. That theirs is the better part I willingly acknowledge. But some of us could not help saying under our breath, when the theory was broached, *e pur si muove*—in a reactionary sense the opposite of Galileo's ; we felt that after all there was an element of truth in the discarded propositions.

Suppose one, perhaps not wholly without a sense of veracity, but yet sufficiently a student of past history to be aware that God has allowed a great deal to enter into His plans

for mankind that is not exactly naked truth as it stands. Suppose one, further, who though not altogether indifferent to the claims of righteousness was yet very conscious of living in a mixed world in which those claims could not always be asserted to the uttermost. Suppose one, yet again, upon whom the "mystery of things" weighed somewhat heavily, who felt that he could believe an ordinance to be divine without being able at once to see all the reasons for it. Suppose this same person to have a kind of natural drawing towards the publicans and sinners as contrasted with "the unco' guid or the religiously righteous"; and suppose that in yielding to this natural drawing he was conscious of a special attraction in the idea of "*free forgiveness*"; and suppose that the atmosphere in which his mind habitually moved was that expressed in Browning's

What I aspired to be,  
And was not, comforts me.

Suppose a mind like this in an attitude of inquiry, with no strong philosophic instinct and content with something a good way short of ultimate truth, but in part a student of the Bible and conscious how much both Testaments had to say about "forgiveness" without any hint of anything behind or beyond, and in part an observer of the more pathetic side of human frailty. Is there not in these conditions the making, at least, of a different point of view from that of Dr. Moberly and Dr. Du Bose?

I believe that there is the making of such a different point of view. But I hasten to add, as I began by saying, that I am very nearly satisfied with the revised statement of the position as I find it now put forth by Dr. Du Bose. And I believe that he will accept the one or two modifications for which I should still like to ask. I should like to have a clear understanding that the actual righteousness for which he contends belongs strictly *to the ultimate truth*



*of things.* That means that, for most of us, it will never be attained otherwise than very imperfectly on this side the grave. This is just a case in which we must let

the heavenly period  
Perfect the earthen.

We have the admission that, for St. Paul, in the Epistle to the Romans, the first stage and phase of the matter, the stage of repentance and forgiveness, "is so uppermost for the time that he almost seems to treat it as the whole Gospel." And the reason is obvious, because for so many of us it is the urgent, insistent, dominating stage in the practical experience of life. I, on my part, am quite ready to admit that ultimately, in the Divine counsels, there must be "forgiveableness" corresponding to the forgiveness; but that is a question for God and for His government of the world, not for us; at least we may be content with the simple knowledge that it is there.

Dr. Du Bose has touched with a needle's point the heart of the matter when he speaks of "the half-grace of forgiveness" and "the whole-grace of redemption and deliverance." But, having won our assent to this as a statement of underlying principle, he will I think lend an ear to our petition that it may not be used to the disparagement of forgiveness, which is far too precious and beautiful a thing to have disparaged.

The two views are not alternatives; the one is included in the other; it is the first step, the initial stage in the carrying out of the great scheme of salvation. All I would contend for is that this first step is for practically all of us so near at hand, so important and so indispensable, that we cannot afford to relegate it to a second place even in thought. It is quite true that everything that can be called a scheme must be looked at as a whole, and cannot be rightly interpreted apart from its end. But at the same time, in the



case before us, the end is so remote—it concerns us really in another state of existence than the present—that it seems to me even now that there is some lack of proportion in the relative treatment of end and beginning. At least we must always remember that Dr. Du Bose is a philosopher, and is writing as a philosopher.

#### IV.

We are, of course, compelled to touch only upon a selection of points, and in that way much that is very noticeable has to be passed over. I should, however, like in passing just to call attention to what seems to me to be a particularly valuable paragraph on the place in history and in the Divine scheme of the Law. This is very apt to be misunderstood, and the following comments will do more than anything I remember to have seen to redress the balance.

There is so much said in St. Paul's presentation of the Gospel of the impotence and consequent superseding of the Law, that we are in danger of forgetting under his seeming disparagement how much he is really magnifying it. The fact is that the Gospel itself is only the Gospel in so far as it is the true, and the only, fulfilling of the Law. The Gospel is the power to fulfil the Law. And if there had not been first the developed experience and sense of the Law itself and of the necessity of fulfilling it ; and then the no less true experience of the impossibility of the Law fulfilling itself in us, or of our fulfilling it in ourselves ; and then again, the experience of actual transgression and the consequent sense of sin,—if all this had not gone before, there would have been neither truth in itself nor possible meaning for us in the Gospel of Jesus Christ. The Law, therefore, was the most immediate and essential presupposition of the Gospel ; and the Hebrew development of the moral sense and the moral law, the Hebrew passion for righteousness and sense of sin, was the most necessary historical preparation for the advent of the Gospel. (p. 24 f.)

But in regard to the train of thought that has so far been occupying us, the leading point that still requires to have something said about it is the objective ground of salva-

tion; in other words, the Death of Christ. On this head I believe that the following will bring out the points that I should most desire to emphasize.

To go no further as yet, I am convinced that the term *sacrifice* and the idea or principle for which it stands can never be dispensed with. To begin with, it is not Jewish but universal, and although it has been and still is undergoing the refining and purifying treatment to which all human thought and feeling needs to be continuously subject, yet all future progress in the matter can be only in the direction of its better understanding and fuller appropriation. At the same time it ought to be finally decided that we are going to interpret the meaning of sacrifice by the universal and eternal truth of it realized in the life and death of Christ, and not going to bring that truth down to fit into the little system of Jewish, or any other incomplete and imperfect human thought or understanding of it. In other words, we shall interpret the sacrifice of Christ by itself, or in its independent and inherent significance, and make use of all prior meanings or uses of sacrifice as only pointing to and not at all sufficing to express or explain it.

One other principle or method of procedure I wish to make plain. As humanity will never be known except in the completeness of its exposition in Jesus Christ, so Jesus Christ cannot be known except in most essential and universal terms of our humanity. To understand our Lord in any act or situation of human life it is necessary to understand what is the eternally proper or right human attitude or action in that situation. And so in general I would say that what Jesus Christ did in our humanity in order to be our salvation was just precisely what humanity needed of itself to be and to do in order to be saved. We exactly express or explain any act of His, and so the supreme and decisive act, when we say that humanity did it in His person, and that it was just precisely what humanity needed to do in order to its own redemption and completion. In His person humanity righted itself with God, redeemed itself from sin, raised itself from death. . . . Up to the present point I would answer to any question of how we are saved by the death or the blood or the sacrifice of Christ simply in the well-known line of the poet: In His death our sins are dead. (pp. 125-127.)

Here there are two paragraphs, of which the second is both important in itself and very characteristic of the author's thought. But as it will come before us later in another connexion, I will not say more about it now. I might even have postponed the quotation of this second paragraph,

but for the fact that the exposition of our present subject would have been too incomplete without it ; and the two paragraphs together really take us to the centre of the matter.

In regard to the first paragraph, I would express the pleasure with which I read Dr. Du Bose's statement. It has all the philosophic breadth and care to which we are accustomed from him ; the warning that we must interpret the lower by the higher, and not the higher by the lower, is very far from being superfluous. And yet I am very glad that so modern a thinker should not discard but should rather emphasize the conception of the Death of Christ as a sacrifice. As one who comes to these questions from different antecedents and from a different point of view, I welcome the more than usually sympathetic treatment of the ideas I cherish from Dr. Du Bose. He does not, I rejoice to say, dismiss the idea of Vicarious Suffering, or even the idea of Substitution. It would be more than human to expect that, holding the philosophy that he does, he should do otherwise than (as I should put it) try to minimize the force of these conceptions. It seems to be something of a relief to him, having recognized their reality, to be able to pass on and leave them behind. I should like, for myself, to go a little further than this ; I should like to dwell upon the place that, if we look steadily at it, Vicarious Suffering really holds in the nature of things and, mysterious as this dispensation of Providence may be, I should like to dwell on the deep pathos and beauty of it from the side of the sufferer.

## V.

A marked characteristic of Dr. Du Bose's work is its freshness, independence, and originality. I have said that it all hangs together as an interconnected whole. Even

where he is continuing the thought of others, that thought has passed through the crucible of his own mind, and it comes forth as his own. But in some cases I suspect that the originality goes beyond this. The following is striking.

We have then to inquire into the meaning of our Lord's having come in the likeness of sinful flesh, or of the flesh of sin. From the longest and most careful reflection upon the language and the matter of the New Testament, I am unable to accept the words as containing in themselves the implication that our Lord came into a nature or condition which was *like* but was *not* the flesh of sin. I feel the theological or doctrinal difficulty, but I also feel that that, and that alone, is the reason or excuse for modifying the meaning of words which are nowhere else so modified. I should much rather meet the real difficulty some other way; or, if I cannot fairly do so, then face it squarely. Like and likeness in the New Testament do not mean "like, but different"; they mean like in the sense of identical. When our Lord was made, or became, in the likeness of men, He did not become something similar to but not the same as man; He became *man*. When He was tempted in all points like as we are, His temptations were not in some points only and not in others like our own; they were essentially and identically our own, with the sole additional circumstance, which does not affect the nature or character of the temptations, that whereas all we are overcome by them, He overcame them. And, humanly speaking, that is all the difference between sin and holiness. Sin or holiness cannot be in mere nature or condition; they can be only in what *we* are or do in the nature or the condition." (p. 221 f.)

In accordance with the argument of this fundamental passage there are a number of places in which it is insisted that the victory of Christ over sin must be in all ways parallel with ours ("there was that in Him which He needed to deny, to mortify, to crucify," p. 173; cf. pp. 107, 135, 144, 174, etc.). I am not prepared to challenge the conclusion as a whole; on the contrary, I believe that it may be defended both philosophically and exegetically; but I am afraid that I must challenge at least one important premiss on which it rests. It is a very sweeping and untenable statement to say that "like and likeness in the New Testament . . . mean like in the sense of identical." We



have only to think of the formula so frequent in the Gospels, "the kingdom of heaven is like, or likened, unto" mustard seed, leaven, etc. Every one knows that "like" in these cases is very far from implying identity; the use is rather wide and lax, and denotes sometimes even a small degree of resemblance.

Another very questionable statement is the following:—

St. Paul objects to the *mediator* in the phraseology of Christianity, because a mediator is not of one but of two; whereas God and man are not two, but one in Christ, and there is nothing, not even a mediator, between them. (p. 243.)

Surely it is forgotten here that the one instance in which St. Paul does exclude the word "mediator" (Gal. iii. 19, 20) has nothing to do with Christianity, but has reference to the *promise* of God in the Old Testament. On the other hand 1 Tim. ii. 5, Heb. viii. 6, ix. 15, xii. 24, expressly affirm the use of the word in Christian phraseology.

In the same context exception is taken to "communion or fellowship" as inadequate renderings of *koinonia*.

I object to the words communion and fellowship simply as not going all the way of that unity of God and man in Christ which is the truth of the Holy Ghost. The truth of the Spirit of God is the truth of the spirit of man. The *koinonia* is not real or complete so long as the spirits are two and not one. We have it in its completeness only as the eternal, personal Spirit of God is the actual personal spirit of the man.

Doctrinally (as we shall see) this is important, and I should not wish to question it. But, for myself, I have always regarded "communion" as the exact equivalent of *koinonia*; it surely means an actual sharing in, actual partaking of, or joint possession.

As I am upon these small points, I may perhaps just mention two rather disconcerting misprints on page 131: line 8 from bottom, "place" should be "peace"; on page 22, line 16, "prophecy," should I think be "prophesy." Three Greek words occur in the book, and two of these have



wrong accents. As in the previous volume, there are one or two examples of doubtful grammar ; to us in the old country such a construction as this would not be tolerable, "it is not part God and part we, but all God and all we" (p. 37, cf. p. 32) ; we should avoid it somehow probably by saying "part God and part ourselves."

## VI.

I suppose that the most really central and really important of all the problems discussed in the book is that relating to what Dr. Du Bose himself calls "the universal humanity of our Lord," that property of His Person by virtue of which He not only represents but expresses "the universal right mind of humanity." We have already quoted (p. 402 *supra*) one significant passage in which this difficult conception is applied with marked lucidity. I will place by the side of this another, also very lucid, which I think not only helps to explain the idea but also helps us to understand its genesis.

All the Old Testament promises fulfilled in Christ were primarily promises made to humanity, and to be fulfilled finally only in the general life and destiny of man. The interpretation of one such promise, which will do for all, may be studied in the second chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews. There is a promise made to man that, though for a time made lower than the angels, he shall be exalted above them and to the head of God's creation. Now as yet we see this promise very far from fulfilled in man, or in humanity at large, but we do see it most completely fulfilled in one man, Christ Jesus ; and fulfilled in Him as head and representative and forerunner of all. It pleased God, for and through whom are all things, in bringing many sons to glory, to perfect (first) the Captain of their salvation. The promises are made generally to man ; they are fulfilled first in the Son of man ; and then through Him they are fulfilled in all who are in Him" (p. 120.)

We are familiar with this aspect of Biblical Prophecy and its interpretation. We are familiar with the subtle and easy transitions from collective to individual personality, and *vice versâ*. We know how the "I" of the Psalms

often stands for the community. We know how the Servant of Jehovah represents the nation in terms of the individual and as finding expression from time to time in some select individual. We know how (e.g. in Ps. lxxxix. 19-45) the promises to David and to Israel pass into each other, and are finally fulfilled in a personal Messiah. This alternate expansion and contraction of idea is undoubtedly characteristic of the Bible. There is also something very like it in the Patristic treatment of the Person of Christ. Dr. Du Bose may well claim to have upon his side in what he says on this head both "the truth of the Scripture and the mind of the Church." He also has the emphatic agreement of such a modern as Dr. Moberly.

And yet such teaching is sure to be called in question. It is bound to be rejected by all Individualists in philosophy. When I reviewed *Atonement and Personality* in 1901 I had not a little hesitation on the subject myself; but I may be allowed to say that since that date I have been more and more led to think that my English friend and my American friend are right.

It cannot be said that the latter has not the courage of his opinions, or that he fails to meet the difficulties involved in them fairly and squarely. He states the principal objection thus :—

One says, "You lay great stress upon the view that our Lord was not a man, but man. I find this a difficult conception; does it mean that humanity has a concrete real existence apart from the individual persons who are human, and that this Universal becomes visible in Christ? If this be so, does it not lead us to a metaphysical Realism, not now generally held?" (p. 297.)

The answer Dr. Du Bose gives is as follows :—

The universality of our Lord's humanity is only explicable upon the fact that His personality is a divine one. It is only God in it that can make it applicable to all or the truth of all. And since, according to St. Paul, it is always Christ Himself who brings Himself to us and makes all that is His our own, it follows that, according to

St. Paul, Jesus Christ can be to us nothing less than divine. The concrete universal of humanity which may be found in Jesus Christ belongs to it not as humanity but as God in humanity. It is God in it which makes that particular humanity of our Lord, His holiness, His righteousness, His life, valid and available for all ; so that every man may find himself in Christ, and in Christ find himself.

It is substantially the same answer that (as I showed in my previous article) is given by Dr. Moberly. There is only this difference, that Dr. Moberly refers this all-embracing activity more explicitly to the Holy Spirit, who is the Spirit of Christ and of God. It is of course only a difference of language, the meaning is precisely the same. The Holy Spirit is the bond which binds all humanity together in one. In each one of us He is present after our measure, but in Christ He dwelt as the fulness of the Godhead bodily. It is that fulness of indwelling which gathers together the multitudinous units into Him and communicates His experiences to them.

The whole work of Jesus Christ in humanity must be expressible, whether or no we may succeed in expressing it, in terms of distinctively human activity and experience, human effort and attainment, human predestination and realization. Jesus Christ accomplished and became precisely what it was the proper and destined task of humanity in Him to accomplish and become. This is not to say that the work of Christ is not equally expressible in terms of the divine activity. Jesus Christ means to us, what God is, and has done, and is doing in humanity. God was and is in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, imparting Himself to us and taking us up into participation with Himself. But God is in us only what we are in Him, and God does in us only what we do in Him ; and what that is, must be as perfectly expressible in terms of us as of Him. (p. 225 f.)

The reciprocity is perfect :

The complete being in Christ means the complete being of Christ in us. The branch is completely in the vine only when the life of the vine is completely in the branch. (p. 234.)

I know nothing more instructive than that parable or allegory of the Fourth Gospel. As the sap circulates through the vine, so do spiritual forces circulate through that Body

of which Christ is the Head ; and life in circulation carries with it the properties of the source from which it springs.

I will only speak of one more difficulty which Dr. Du Bose directly meets, so far as it can be met. Here, too, there is no flinching.

One says, "My difficulty is as follows : The agony in the Garden and the cry of My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me ? seem to show that our Lord was as personally distinct from God as we ourselves are, that His personality, His self-consciousness and will, was not a divine personality, but a human ; so human as to be capable of losing its hold upon God, just as we may lose our hold upon God." (p. 298 f.)

This is just a case where Dr. Du Bose's thorough-going humanizing (if I may so call it) of our Lord stands him in good stead. He asks whether we should wish "to construe these experiences of our Lord into some other, non-human experiences." And then he goes on to ask if the whole difficulty is not "already expressed for us in the very word Incarnation ; a difficulty which the most of us evade by simply not taking the word seriously, in the fulness and reality of its meaning ?" He adds : "In the instance we have been analyzing, what do we see but the disposition common to us all to find in our Lord's temptation experiences that are not human, and in Himself one who was not truly man" (p. 301).

This is precisely the kind of language used (as I also showed before) by Dr. Moberly, who deprecated the attempt so often made "to keep open, as it were, a sort of non-human sphere, or aspect of the Incarnation."

It is a pleasure to me to bring out once more the harmonious thinking of my two friends. Dr. Moberly has no nearer or truer successor than the American theologian whose work I have been studying, more than 4,000 miles away.

W. SANDAY.

### *THE OLDEST WRITTEN GOSPEL.*

IN reviewing Professor Harnack's study of "Luke the Physician," we found that the best part of a very notable book was the comparison of the sections which are common to Luke and Mark, and the analysis of the relation between those two writers. In this detailed comparison the Author<sup>1</sup> could not confine himself to considerations of words (that vice of the nineteenth century): he was obliged constantly to take things and facts of real life into consideration. The problem before him was to determine what were the principles on which Luke had dealt with the narrative of his authority, Mark. His task, which would have been impossible if the authority whom he used had perished, was facilitated by the fact that the same original document which Luke employed in those sections lies now before us as the Gospel of Mark; and it is possible to see exactly what changes Luke introduced, and to determine what reasons and principles guided him in making certain modifications in the narrative of Mark. As a whole, the result of the author's examination was that Luke reproduces the facts accurately, that he to a certain degree changes the words in the interests of literary style, but that even these verbal changes are generally confined to single words or short phrases; and that there is a notable absence of all attempt to introduce new meaning into Mark's narrative or to intrude into the record ideas belonging to the age when Luke was writing. Luke improves the language of Mark, where he follows him; but represents his meaning with impartial and remarkable fidelity. Where he desires in his Gospel to give more information than Mark gives,

<sup>1</sup> As before, in order to avoid frequent repetition of the personal name we shall refer to Professor Harnack as the Author.



he does it in distinct sections, based evidently on other authorities, written or oral. We may add that the fair presumption is that he represents those other authorities with the same perfect fidelity as he shows in the case of Mark.

We found ourselves compelled to differ from the Author chiefly in two respects. In the first place, there were other parts of his book in which he seemed to be too much under the influence of purely verbal methods, a kind of reasoning of which we entertain a profound distrust, and one which has led to many errors in many departments of literature ; purely literary considerations of language and style may often afford valuable suggestions and start new trains of thought, but they have never produced any results that can be relied on permanently, unless they are constantly guided and tested and controlled by more objective and real methods. The plan of his new book, which forms the subject of the present article, leaves little or no room for this fault.

In the second place, the Author seemed to us occasionally to have not quite freed himself from certain prepossessions and assumptions which ruled the hard and unilluminative criticism of the later nineteenth century. That that criticism was needed as a protest against older dogmatism and previous assumptions, I should be the last to deny, and have always freely admitted ; but it was only on the destructive side that it was sound ; its attempts at reconstruction were valueless and misleading, because the negative presumptions from which it started vitiated all its positive inferences. We shall have to dissent on this ground from some opinions expressed in the Author's latest books.

In the Author's new book, *Sayings and Speeches of Jesus*,<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Sprüche und Reden Jesu, die zweite Quelle des Matthaeus und des Lukas* : Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1907. *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Neue Testament, II. Heft.*

forming the second part of his *Contributions to the Introduction to the New Testament*, the method of detailed comparison, which ruled in the best portion of his *Luke the Physician*, is carried out even more completely, and forms the basis of the whole study. Hence I find myself in cordial agreement with the method and the results to a much greater degree than in the previous case. The main result, that the lost common Source of Luke and Matthew was a work earlier than Mark, appears to me to be firmly established, and to lead straight to conclusions of the highest importance; although those conclusions are not in perfect harmony with all the Author's opinions, they seem to spring inevitably from his main line of argument.

That the first, and in many respects the most important, authority on which Matthew as well as Luke relied was the Gospel of Mark, practically in the form in which we possess it, is now generally admitted. In studying the relation of Luke to this Source, the Author did not require to take into account Matthew's version of the same Source, because Luke was wholly independent of Matthew, and the Source still lies before us. But in the case of the second common Source of Luke and Matthew, the problem is a far more complicated and difficult one. The Source has been lost, and it is only through the comparison of Luke and Matthew that we can recover an outline of its contents and character, and to a certain extent reconstruct the lost original document. This original is for brevity's sake referred to as Q; and on pp. 88-102 the Author prints all of it that he believes to be recoverable with certainty or high probability. As he says himself, it is necessary to fall back occasionally on conjecture and hypothesis, as the evidence does not justify perfect confidence.

In the course of this article we shall diverge slightly from the Author's custom, and shall use the symbol Q to denote

the restored form of the lost Source, as given by him, pp. 88-102, while we shall refer to the Source in its complete and original form (which was indubitably much longer than the Author's restoration), by some circumlocution, such as "the lost common Source" or "the Collection of Sayings" (a name used by the Author, but not in our view an adequate name, though it rests perhaps on ancient authority).

The original of Q was written in Aramaic; but both Luke and Matthew used the same Greek translation, and therefore throughout the Author's work Q denotes a certain Greek book, and not the older Aramaic original. The question is mentioned whether Luke or Matthew may occasionally have gone behind the Greek form Q and consulted the Aramaic original for some details; but the Author is confident that such a procedure, if it ever happened, was extremely rare, and that generally Q alone may safely be assumed as the single and final source of a certain large portion of Luke and Matthew, about one-sixth of the former and two-elevenths of the latter. Perhaps Aramaic scholars might differ from the Author on this question: it is understood that at least one well-known English scholar, who has taken a very different view, still adheres to his own opinion. But at least there can be no doubt that a Greek translation did exist, and was used by both Luke and Matthew, whether or not they controlled it by consulting the Aramaic in addition. And the Author seems also to have established his theory of Q to the extent that his restoration can be relied on as giving a fair amount of the original document in a trustworthy form, and as permitting certain positive inferences, but not any negative inferences.

Incidentally, in this study of the two largest Sources which Luke and Matthew made use of, one must be strongly

impressed with the utter impossibility of recovering from any single author alone the authorities which he transcribed. Let any one take Luke's Gospel by itself, or Matthew's Gospel by itself, and examine verse by verse the parts that come from Q and from Mark respectively. He must conclude that the problem of analyzing either the Third or the First Gospel separately and distinguishing the Q-parts, the Mark-parts, and the parts taken neither from Q nor from Mark, would have been quite insoluble without extraneous help.

And, more than this, if Mark were lost, while both Luke and Matthew were preserved, it would of course be easy to distinguish the common Matthaео-Lukan parts from the parts peculiar to each ; but it would be utterly impossible to analyze that common Matthaео-Lukan Gospel into its two parts, the Marcan and the non-Marcan. Only the existence of Mark makes it possible to tell what is Marcan and what is non-Marcan. Yet take Q by itself, and read it apart from Mark, and the least observant scholar must be struck by the difference of character, style, language, and point of view.

Further, if one took Luke's Gospel by itself, and proceeded according to some definite peculiarity, such as, for example, the name of the Holy City, starting from the principle that the passages in which the Hebrew form Jerusalem was used were founded on a different original Source from those parts in which the Greek form Hierosolyma was used, how misleading and absurd would be the results of such an hypothesis ! So in the Acts, the old "critical" (or rather uncritical) idea that the use of the names Paul and Saul indicated two different Sources has probably been abandoned by even the most unenlightened and unprogressive of the modern scholars. It has long been proved conclusively that Luke had a definite purpose

in distinguishing the names Paul and Saul, and employed sometimes the one, sometimes the other, for the sake of historical effect. So, also, he had a clear purpose of his own in distinguishing the names Jerusalem and Hierosolyma, and he actually alters Mark's Hierosolyma into Jerusalem, in order to carry out his own peculiar purpose.<sup>1</sup>

The futility of various other similar criteria might be shown, if it were worth while to do so ; but we pass on, only pausing for a moment to ask whether in the analysis of the Pentateuch too much has not been made of the distinction between the two names of God, Elohim and Jehovah or Yahwe. Even admitting (as we do) that different older Sources lie behind the extant form of the Pentateuch, is it not possible that there may be some purpose guiding the choice of the final compiler or author in his use of the two names ? I always bear in mind the warning words which Robertson Smith often emphatically used in conversation, that, while the diverse Sources of the Pentateuch could on the whole and in the rough be distinguished, it must always be utterly impossible to attain certainty about the precise points and lines of cleavage in the existing text.

A general outline of this pre-Lukan and pre-Matthaeian book Q, then, can be recovered from the agreement of the non-Marcan parts of Luke and Matthew ; but, of course, there remain two important questions to be determined before we can regard the resultant group of literary fragments as a full and trustworthy representative of that old book.

In the first place, did Luke and Matthew take the whole of that book Q and incorporate it in their respective Gospels ? Were there not parts of Q which Luke alone or

<sup>1</sup> EXPOSITOR, Feb. 1907, p. 111 f.



Matthew alone extracted, and for which therefore we have only one authority? It seems to us probable,<sup>1</sup> and even practically certain, that there was a good deal which only one of them incorporated in his Gospel: Luke treats Q with great freedom, and puts in different parts of his Gospel scraps of it which Matthew places side by side as continuous exposition. Such freedom seems quite irreconcilable with the idea that they agreed in utilizing the whole of Q. This part of Q (which we believe to have been considerable) is for the most part hopelessly lost to us. We may conjecture that certain paragraphs or sentences of Matthew alone or of Luke alone were taken from Q; and in such cases arguments from language or style or thought might be fairly brought in to support the conjecture. But such conjectures can never be ranked on the same level as the agreement of Matthew and Luke; and they probably do not apply to any very large part of the book. Yet the attempt ought to be made, and will certainly be often made, to specify and collect those parts of the lost Sources that were used only by one Evangelist. The Author expressly recognizes that this is a work which awaits and will reward patient investigation (pp. 2, 121).

Further, are there not passages in which Q coincided in subject with Mark, and the latter seemed to Luke and Matthew to be preferable—not necessarily as divergent, but as more complete or better expressed? Was it the case—as it would be if the Author's restoration of Q were even approximately complete—that Q never, or hardly ever, covered a part of the same ground as Mark? There seems an overwhelming probability that two such books must have agreed oftener than appears in the Author's restoration. It is clear that they covered the same ground as regards the relations of Jesus with John the Baptist and

<sup>1</sup> The Author holds this opinion.

as regards the Temptation, but covered it in very different ways. In the case of the Temptation, for example, Mark restricts himself to a brief sentence ; and both Luke and Matthew here follow Q. There is no inconsistency or disagreement between Mark and Q ; but the latter is far more detailed and complete. Were there not many cases in which the sharp and clear narrative of Mark was preferred by the two later Synoptics ? This seems to us inevitably to have been the case ; and all these parts of Q are still more hopelessly lost than the part described (or assumed) in our previous paragraph.

The loss of this part has resulted in imparting to the Author's Q an appearance of being almost wholly confined to Sayings and Speeches of Jesus. This appearance we must consider to be untrue. It is clear even from the agreement of Luke and Matthew that Q was not wholly free from narrative : the parts relating to John the Baptist and the Temptation and the Centurion of Capernaum contain some narrative ; the sections in the Author's Q, 3, 18, 22, 29, 30, 54, and others, must obviously have been accompanied by some narrative, however brief. In many others it is inconceivable that a first-hand authority (as the Author considers the writer of Q to have been) could give such a disjointed and disconnected scrap as that which can be got from the agreement of Matthew and Luke.

We must consider that there was more narrative in the lost original document than appears now in Q, and that sections 1, 2, 13, 14 of the Author's restoration give a truer conception of its character than most of the other sections. It was not a mere collection of sayings, but a narrative, noted down by a person whose interest lay mainly in the sayings and the teaching of Jesus, and who made the narrative subsidiary to the speeches.

These conclusions, to which we seem to be involuntarily

driven by the facts, are not at all inconsistent with the Author's views ; but they certainly modify in some degree the picture which he draws of Q. The opinion which on the whole he is disposed to hold is that Q is the work of the Apostle Matthew, and that it is the collection of Logia which Matthew, as Papias says, composed. The Author fully concedes that Papias understood this collection of Logia to be simply the First Gospel (p. 172) ; but he tends to the view that Papias in this matter misunderstood his authority, that Matthew merely gathered together a collection of sayings, and that both Luke and the writer of the First Gospel made use of the collection.

Here we meet one of the Author's presumptions and prepossessions, which we cannot sympathize with. He speaks of the type of a Gospel having been fixed by Mark ;<sup>1</sup> and holds that, after the type was thus fixed, no other type of Gospel story could be composed. In every respect, and from every point of view, we must differ *toto caelo* from this assumption and from all the vast consequences that follow from it. The type of the Gospel was fixed by the facts, and not by the accident of Mark's composing a Gospel. This type dominated the whole situation, and guided the thought and word of the Apostles from the moment when they began to understand the facts, i.e. from the first Pentecost. In this type of the Gospel, the death of Christ was the essential and critical factor ; and on this factor the whole narrative turns. That was the case with the speeches of Peter and of Stephen at the very beginning—and, as we take it, with every exposition of Christian truth thereafter, except when from time to time a "new theology" arose and lingered for a short time, only to pass away, often finding its grave in the mind in which it originated.

<sup>1</sup> See p. 174.

But the Author is obliged, by his assumption as to Mark's having fixed the type of the Gospel, to hold that the speeches of Peter and Stephen are merely the free compositions of Luke, expressing his later ideas of what they ought to have said. So he is in consistency bound to hold, and so he does hold, even in his latest expression in *Lukas der Artzt*. But, holding as we do that the facts determined the type of the Gospel and imposed it on the minds of all the Apostles, we are confident that Luke's report of those early speeches is historical and trustworthy ; and we are utterly sceptical as to the possibility that Mark, or any other man, could have fixed immutably and permanently the type of all subsequent Gospels.

But, it will be objected, here in Q is a Gospel which is utterly different from the established type, which never mentions the death of Christ or bases the efficacy of Christ's teaching on His death—a Gospel which the Author, mainly on the ground of this character, shows to be earlier than Mark's Gospel, but not very much earlier.

This is an important argument, which needs and will reward careful consideration. It involves two points, (1) Is it true that Q took no notice of the death of Christ ? (2) If that was the case, when was Q written ?

It is, of course, correct procedure on the Author's part to restrict the scope of Q in the first instance to the parts which can be restored with approximate certainty from the agreement of Matthew and Luke, and to set aside rigorously all that does not rest on this assured basis—though even thus there are some places where, as he says, it is impossible to avoid conjectural work entirely. But in deducing from this restoration the character of the lost Source, one must remember that this restored Q is incomplete, and one must draw no inferences of a purely negative character, i.e., one must never infer that there was in the



lost Source no mention of any particular event or group of events merely on the negative evidence that in the restored Q no mention occurs of the event or group of events. To justify such an inference it is necessary to show that Q is positively inconsistent with the supposition that the event or group of events was known to the writer of the lost Source.

Accordingly, to prove that the death of Christ was not mentioned in that lost common Source of Matthew and Luke, it is not sufficient reason to find that there is in Q (as determined by their agreement) no mention of Christ's death. It would, as far as this reason goes, be quite possible that Q (which on the narrative side is scanty and confessedly poorer than Mark) was in the conclusion so distinctly inferior to Mark that the latter (combined to some extent with other Sources) was preferred by both Matthew and Luke; it might even be possible to speculate whether Q was not used by one of the two alone in some parts.

But there is stronger ground for the Author's view: the teaching of Q is inconsistent with the idea that the writer of the lost Source regarded the death of Jesus as the fundamental fact in the Gospel. One acquires the impression throughout that Jesus was to him the great Teacher, not that He was the Redeemer by His death: Jesus was to him the Son of God, the King who reveals the Kingdom of Heaven. In the Teaching of Jesus, the Kingdom of God stood out prominently, and its nature, with the conditions of entering it, were emphatically stated: the sons of the Kingdom, who had the right of birth, i.e. the Jews, were to be rejected, and the Gentiles from all the world were to find a home with Abraham and Isaac in the Kingdom of God (sections 42, 13, 30); it was not a Kingdom of this world, it was a process of development and growth in the mind of the individual (section 40): hence,



to speak against the Holy Spirit (which works this process in the mind of man) is the fatal and unpardonable sin (section 34b, 29) : in this it is already implied, as is said in Luke xvii. 21, that "the Kingdom of God is within you." The way of salvation, i.e. the Kingdom of God, does not lie outside of, or apart from, common life, but in the ordinary life of man (i.e., it is the spirit in which that life is lived); and every man has the opportunity of being justified by the spirit of wisdom (section 15, 12). The revelation by the Son is the only and necessary way by which man can attain to the knowledge of God (section 25); this way of salvation is a difficult path with a single narrow entrance (section 41); it was unknown to many prophets, though now shown publicly to those who saw and heard Him (section 26); it is hidden from the wise and the educated, but revealed to infants (section 25); the Kingdom of God has come near those cities whither the true teachers and Apostles go (section 22, 16); there is need for many workers in this harvesting of the world (section 18).

In this Teaching there lies implicit the Gospel of Christ, but the foundation on which alone (according to the universal Christian Gospel from Peter and Stephen onwards) the Kingdom of Heaven can be built up, is wanting, for there is no allusion to the death of Christ, which gives the needed driving force and the power.

The question then is, when could such Teaching as this be written down in a book? The Author replies that it was written down shortly before Mark's Gospel, but after Peter and Stephen and Paul had been preaching the Gospel of the death of Christ. The type of the Christian Gospel had not then been fixed by Mark; and, in the Author's view, apparently, the Gospel might be anything that any writer pleased until Mark had shown what a Gospel ought

to be, after which no writer could do anything except follow the type as fixed by Mark. He wastes no thought on the influence and the Gospel of Paul. He apparently believes that the other Twelve Apostles preached anything they found good in the way of teaching from the beginning down till Mark's publication; no one perceived what was the meaning and power of Christ's death until Mark's Gospel fixed the type.

The Author's theory mistakes literature for life, and regards the chance of Mark's publication as determining the course of subsequent Christianity. He forgets that Mark was only an accidental agent; he forgets that Mark wrote only what the development of Christian teaching forced him to write; he forgets that the Gospel existed before Mark and independent of Mark. He thinks, even, that Mark, if he had known Q, would have given a different character to his own Gospel.

As to the date when this collection of Sayings was gathered together, the Author expresses a definite opinion. He considers that the book of Sayings and Speeches was composed before the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, and before the Gospel of Mark. Otherwise he leaves the question of date an open one, except that he will not allow it to be much earlier than Mark. This he infers from the fact that the Gospel of Mark is wholly independent of and unconnected with the collection of Sayings; he argues that if this collection had been long in circulation before Mark wrote, it would be unintelligible that Mark should not have known it and used it (p. 172). This reasoning seems inconclusive and unconvincing. It involves one big assumption, viz., that Mark desired to make his work supersede that older book. Now, if we follow the authority of Papias that Mark wrote the "Gospel according to Peter," there seems not the slightest reason to think that

he would desire to supersede the older narrative, or to intermingle with Peter's narrative the account given by another (whether Matthew or any one else), or that he would feel himself bound to introduce speeches and sayings from another Source into the narrative as he gathered it from Peter. It is perfectly natural and probable that he may have known the old book of "Sayings and Speeches," and yet composed a narrative according to Peter.

Only one explanation can be suggested which would make the Author's date for Q conceivable ; and that is that the writer of the lost Source in the first part of his work described the mind and belief of the disciples as they were while Christ was still living, and then in the last part described the change that was produced in them after the death of Christ had revealed to them the real truth. But such an artificial explanation cannot for a moment be entertained. The Author does not even think it worthy of notice, but tacitly rejects it and insists on the simplicity of the lost Source. This explanation is utterly inconsistent with the possibilities of the situation. It supposes a straining after dramatic effect which cannot be reconciled either with the character of early Christianity or with the habits and established canons of ancient literature.

We conclude, then, that the date assigned by the Author is impossible in itself and inconsistent with his own views. The lost Source cannot be placed either between Mark and Luke, or a little before Mark. It cannot be placed later than the time when the disciples began, at the first Pentecost, to understand the true nature of the Gospel, and Peter began to declare it publicly, establishing it on the firm foundation of the sacrifice of Christ's death.

A date between the death of Christ and the first Pentecost is equally impossible ; and is not likely even to be suggested by any one. In that period of gloom and despair,

who would sit down to compose a Gospel in the tone of Q ?

There is only one possibility. The lost common Source of Luke and Matthew (to which, as the Author says, Luke attached even higher value than he did to Mark) was written while Christ was still living. It gives us the view which one of His disciples entertained of Him and His teaching during His life-time, and may be regarded as authoritative for the view of the disciples generally. This extremely early date was what gave the lost Source the high value that it had in the estimation of Matthew and Luke, and yet justified the freedom with which they handled it and modified it by addition and explanation (for the Author's comparison of the passages as they appear in Luke and Matthew shows that the lost Common Source was very freely treated by them). On the one hand, it was a document practically contemporary with the facts, and it registered the impression made on eye-witnesses by the words and acts of Christ. On the other hand, it was written before those words and acts had begun to be properly understood by even the most intelligent eye-witnesses. So, for example, John says (ii. 22) that "when He was risen from the dead, His disciples remembered that He had said this unto them," and they then comprehended the reference to His death which at the time they had not understood.

The same tone is observable frequently in the Synoptic Gospels ; so, for example, in Matthew xvi. 21 f. : "From that time began Jesus to show unto His disciples how that He must . . . suffer many things . . . and be killed and the third day be raised up. And Peter . . . began to rebuke Him, saying, Be it far from Thee, Lord ; this shall never be unto Thee. But He turned and said unto Peter, Get thee behind Me, Satan ; thou art a stumbling-block

unto Me : for thou mindest not the things of God, but the things of men."

This is found also in Mark ; but Luke omitted the reference to Peter, apparently disliking the harshness of the language.

Then there immediately follows in Matthew a passage strongly reminiscent of Q as restored by the Author ; compare xvi. 24 with Q, section 46, and xvi. 25 with Q, section 57. In fact, xvi. 24, 25, are almost a repetition of x. 38, 39, but the former belongs to the Marcan portion of Luke and Matthew, the latter belongs to Q.

Luke ix. 44 f. : " While all were marvelling at all the things which He did, He said unto His disciples, Let these words sink into your ears ; for the Son of Man shall be delivered up into the hands of men. But they understood not this saying, and it was concealed from them, that they should not perceive it : and they were afraid to ask Him about this saying." This also is common to Mark ix. 31, 32, and Matthew xvii. 23, but the latter gives only the words of Jesus, without remarking on the ignorance of the disciples.

Luke ix. 54-56 mentions the rebuke to James and John on the way towards Jerusalem for their suggestion, which was so incongruous with the spirit of Christ and the occasion. This is Lukan only.

Luke xviii. 31-34 : " He took unto Him the twelve and said unto them, Behold we go up to Jerusalem, and all the things that are written by the prophets shall be accomplished unto the Son of man. For He shall be delivered up . . . and the third day He shall rise again. And they understood none of these things ; and this saying was hid from them, and they perceived not the things that were said." Matthew xx. 17-19 and Mark x. 32-34 mention that Jesus revealed the coming facts to the twelve disciples, but do not remark on their failure to understand.



The Author, if we do not misunderstand him, takes a different view of the passages such as these : he regards them apparently as being of distinctly later origin, barely of apostolic period, but rather representing the reflections and moralizing of a later generation with regard to the simpler ideas entertained in an earlier time, by earlier minds, before the later views about the death of Christ and its meaning had established themselves : such has been the Author's view always.

We would not affirm that the writers of the canonical Gospels never added such reflexions ; but that tone and attitude of mind seems to us to have originated in the period immediately following the Crucifixion, and to be the inevitable accompaniment or expression of the gradual realization by the disciples of their new knowledge that the death of Christ was a necessary and fundamental part of His Gospel. In our view, the utmost that can be attributed to any of the evangelists is that he gave more sharp and emphatic form to those reflexions ; we cannot allow that he created them.

The Author shows repeatedly, both as regards the Markan parts and as regards Q, that while Luke sometimes gave more emphatic expression to the ideas of his Sources, he did not add anything of consequence to them on his own authority. In fact, as we previously pointed out,<sup>1</sup> the Author's results from his detailed examination of Luke, sentence by sentence and paragraph by paragraph, stand in the most marked contrast with his general reflexions upon Luke's character as a historian. In both the Author's volumes Luke bears the detailed test even better than Matthew ; the Author declares that while Matthew on the whole preserves the actual words of the Sources more exactly than Luke, he in certain rare cases adds something

<sup>1</sup> EXPOSITOR, Jan. 1907, pp. 107, 113.

of his own to them, whereas he finds no case where Luke adds to the Source any expression betraying the spirit and ideas of the later time when he was composing his Gospel. But while the Author's detailed test gives this result, he strongly condemns in general Luke's incapacity, inaccuracy, and untrustworthiness as a historian.

There seems no other supposition but this which would satisfactorily explain the character of Q. On this view everything in it becomes clear. According to this view Jesus stands forth in his lifetime as the great Teacher, because in that way alone He had as yet become known even to the most faithful and devoted of His followers. The way of salvation was the way of right wisdom : knowledge was what Jesus revealed, viz., the knowledge of God the Father. But Jesus alone could impart this knowledge. As He said, " I thank Thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that Thou didst hide these things from the wise and understanding, and didst reveal them unto babes. . . . All things have been delivered unto Me of My Father ; and no one knoweth the Father save the Son and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal Him."<sup>1</sup>

The two sentences which immediately follow this passage in Matthew are regarded by the Author as probably truly words of Jesus, taken, however, not from Q but rather from some other trustworthy Source and placed wrongly in this situation by Matthew. The passage is the familiar and frequently quoted one, Matthew xi. 28-30 : " Come unto Me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you and learn of Me ; for I am meek and lowly in heart ; and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For My yoke is easy, and My burden

<sup>1</sup> Matthew xi. 25-27 ; Luke x. 21-22. The Author regards the omitted part of the last sentence as an interpolation : see especially pp. 204-6.

is light." The Author sees and explains admirably the close relationship of thought and meaning between these two passages. The knowledge of God in the one case is the intellectual aspect of that which in the other case is called in its moral aspect the yoke or burden of duty ; and Jesus describes Himself as at once the conveyer of the instruction and the imposer of the yoke, "take My yoke upon you and learn of Me." This is merely an enforcement in the imperative mood of the truth stated as a fact in the preceding verses. Thus the whole passage runs continuously in perfect sequence.

But the failure in Luke of any parallel to Matthew xi. 28-30 seems to constitute a serious argument that Luke did not find in the lost Common Source those last three verses, for it is not easy to understand how he should have omitted an expression which is so harmonious with the tone and spirit of his Gospel. It is, of course, always an uncertain argument to found any inference on the fact that some saying or event of the vast number out of which a selection had to be made was omitted by Luke : he certainly omitted much that we should have been glad to have, and which we miss. Selection was necessary, and no two persons will select in exactly the same way : one will mourn the omission of something which the other suffered to be crowded out. But there is probably no case where a deliberate omission by Luke seems so strange as this does here ; and hence we must perhaps agree with the Author that Matthew took these three verses from some other Source and placed them here on account of their intrinsic suitability.

We cannot, however, agree with him when he seeks to strengthen this argument by the consideration that the verses common to Luke and Matthew are a statement in the indicative, while the addition peculiar to Matthew is an invitation in the imperative, and that there is too much

change between the situation in the two parts. This reasoning is founded on the assumption, which the Author makes throughout, that what is early in the Gospels is necessarily simpler and more single in tone than what is later. Jesus was a complex character, and His Teaching had many sides ; and we ought to find traces of this complexity in the very earliest faithful presentation of Him. But this is a point which is too important for us to enter upon at present.

The Author rightly finds a corroboration of his opinion that Matthew xi. 28-30 is truly a word of Jesus in 2 Corinthians x. 1 : " I entreat you by the meekness and gentleness of Christ, I who in your presence am lowly among you." <sup>1</sup> We should also be disposed to think that the expressions used in Acts xv. 10-11, 28, rose to the mind of Peter and the Apostles from recollection of the Saying contained in this passage of Matthew.<sup>2</sup> Peter in his speech to the Council said, " Why tempt ye God that ye should put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither we nor our fathers were able to bear ? But we believe that we should be saved through the grace of the Lord Jesus in like manner as they." And the Decree of the Council ordained, " it seemed good . . . to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things." Here the yoke and burden of the Jewish Law is contrasted with the saving grace of Jesus ; and the Author points out that the yoke and burden which is meant in the passage of Q just quoted is that which the

<sup>1</sup> Meekness and lowliness are placed by Paul side by side as important elements in the Christian character in Ephesians iv. 1, 2 : " I beseech you to walk worthily of the calling wherewith ye were called, with all lowliness and meekness " : and also in Colossians iii. 12. The juxtaposition of *πραῦς* and *ταπεινός* (*πραύτης* and *ταπεινοφροσύνη*) was therefore familiar to Paul, and strongly suggests that he knew this Saying (whether from the Collection of Sayings or from oral information).

<sup>2</sup> Whether from their own recollection of the words which they had heard, or from their knowledge of the book of the Sayings ; but the former is, of course, much the more likely supposition.



Pharisees imposed.<sup>1</sup> That the Author is right becomes evident where this passage is combined with Matthew xxiii. 4 (identical in force with Luke xi. 46), which is part of Q, section 33, "the Pharisees bind heavy burdens . . . and lay them on men's shoulders." The heavy burden was the teaching of the Pharisees and of the Law; but the Teaching of Jesus imposed a light burden and an easy yoke.

But it is hardly necessary to go searching with the Author for arguments and external proofs that the words of Matthew xi. 28-30 were in real truth spoken by Jesus, and not invented by a later fancy. The practically universal consent of all subsequent thought has recognized those verses as among the most characteristic, the most exquisite, and the most perfectly adapted to the needs of mankind, that have been preserved to us in the Gospels. No proof can be so strong as that consent, *Securus indicat orbis terrarum*. There was no second Christ to speak those words.

Nor need we restrict their intention so narrowly as the Author seems to do. They are far wider in application than he allows—as wide as the burden of every trial and every sorrow that men know—but they certainly include, as he says, the contrast between the burden of Pharisaic law and the freedom of Christ's teaching; they anticipate the controversy between Paul and the Judaizing party; and they lead up to the Epistle to the Galatians. And what a difference in temper and spirit is there between the Saying of Jesus and the Epistle of Paul, great as the latter is: the difference between Divine word and human.

In conclusion, it is perhaps right to refer to an argument which will weigh with many minds against the date which we assign for the composition of the lost Common Source

<sup>1</sup> The Author does not mention this analogy; and on his view of the late date and spurious character of the Decree, he would explain it in a very different way.



of Luke and Matthew. It is a wide-spread assumption that the earliest Christians did not commit to writing any record of the life or the words of the Saviour ; and that it was only at a later date, after at least the first Epistles of Paul had been written, and when the disciples had ceased to expect the immediate Coming of the Lord and the end of the world, that they began to think of composing accounts of the events and teaching in which their Faith originated. If you ask for reasons to support this assumption, there are none that seem to possess even the slightest value : it is a pure prepossession, which has lasted from the time when everybody believed that the art of writing was a late invention and that the custom of writing spread gradually and slowly, but was in ancient times (as in medieval) rare and unusual. This is a prejudice which has been decisively disproved by recent discovery. The art of writing is very old. The knowledge of writing was far more generally diffused in the east Mediterranean lands in ancient times than it was in mediaeval Europe.

Protestantism first supplied the driving force to popularize reading and writing among the mass of the people in modern times, and from the Protestant countries the custom spread ; but still it is only in a few countries that the familiar use of writing in everyday life is so widely diffused as it was in the most civilized regions of the Mediterranean world about the time of Christ. The whole burden of proof lies with those who maintain that the earliest Christians committed no record to writing, for that view is quite out of harmony with the facts and tone of society in that period and region. In the first chapter of the *Letters to the Seven Churches* the reasons for my view are stated more fully, though even there they are merely given in outline.

We find in the Author here and there signs of the same old evil which has long been blocking progress—the hard,

unsympathetic, self-satisfied, unresponsive and contemptuous attitude in cases where the East perplexes the West, where the first century eludes the comprehension of the nineteenth. In all such cases the nineteenth century way of thought, its refuge from the duty of learning to understand what lay outside of it and beyond its narrow view, was to condemn as "legend" what it could not understand. The word "legend" was used in an unintelligent and irrational way. The late-nineteenth-century scholar did not begin by properly conceiving what is the nature of "legend." He started with a certain fixed standard of instinctive and unreasoning dislike : whatever he could not comprehend, he condemned as "legend." The honest and scientific method in such cases would have been to say simply, "this I do not understand" ; it would have been human and pardonable to add, "since I do not understand it, I am suspicious of it." That the four Gospels, of which even the earliest is long posterior to the events it records and was not written by an eye-witness, are free from "legend" I personally do not maintain ; but that much which has been called legend is of an altogether different character and has nothing about it of the nature of legend, I feel firmly convinced. That the domain ascribed to "legend" in the Gospels by modern scholars has been much diminished in recent years is patent to all. It is much to be desired that those who use the term "legend" in this connexion should begin by understanding and defining clearly what legend is. Even admitting that some statement or narrative in a Gospel is not trustworthy, it does not follow that this statement is legend : it may have originated in some other way. The Author is not free even now from this loose and unscientific way of labelling what he dislikes as "legend." But this topic is too big to discuss at the end of an article.

W. M. RAMSAY.

*THE CONNEXION BETWEEN THE FIFTH AND  
SIXTH CHAPTERS OF 1 CORINTHIANS.*

THE sequence of events during St. Paul's stay at Ephesus, and the exact circumstances under which he wrote the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, are not altogether easy to determine, and the variety of the conclusions which have been reached by competent scholars may be taken to shew that the evidence is insufficient for demonstration. A question upon which a good deal turns is raised by the language of 2 Corinthians vii. 12. Who are *ὁ ἀδικήσας* and *ὁ ἀδικηθεὶς*? Are they to be identified with the offending son and the injured father of 1 Corinthians v., as most of the older commentators supposed? Or is the allusion in 2 Corinthians vii. to some incident, now only matter for conjecture, and quite distinct from that which is the subject of 1 Corinthians v., as most recent editors hold? I do not think that we can give a quite confident answer to these questions, but I shall set down in this paper a few of the considerations which incline me towards the older (and now unfashionable) interpretation. Even if they do not convince others, it may be worth while to call attention to some of the linguistic correspondences between 1 Corinthians and 2 Corinthians, and especially between 1 Corinthians v. and vi.

I have pointed out elsewhere <sup>1</sup> that to understand 1 Corinthians it is necessary to remember its structure. This letter was written in answer to one which had reached St. Paul from Corinth, asking for guidance on certain points, and it contains, besides, references to painful news which had been reported to him as to the state of the Corinthian Church. He had been told of the factions which had

<sup>1</sup> *Expositor's Greek Testament*, vol. iii. p. 7 ff.

arisen, and also of a scandalous case of impurity which had occurred. He devotes chapters i.-iv. to the matter of schism and faction, and chapters v., vi. to the discussion of sins of the flesh and the proper way to deal with them. Then he passes on to answer in detail the questions which the Corinthians had put to him in their letter, each separate topic on which they had asked for advice being introduced by *περὶ δέ . . . περὶ δὲ ὧν ἐγράψατε, καλὸν ἀνθρώπῳ γυναικὸς μὴ ἅπτεσθαι* (1 Cor. vii. 1); *περὶ δὲ τῶν παρθένων* (1 Cor. vii. 25); *περὶ δὲ τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων* (1 Cor. viii. 1); *περὶ δὲ τῶν πνευματικῶν* (1 Cor. xii. 1); *περὶ δὲ τῆς λογίας* (1 Cor. xvi. 1). We are only concerned now with chapters v., vi.; and from the systematic arrangement of the letter and the circumstances which drew it forth, we should expect to find that these were concerned with the same topic. He has said what he has to say about schism, and before he goes on to answer special questions, he must deal with the only other topic which (so far as we know) came directly before him, in relation to the Corinthian Church, at this moment. Hence chapters v., vi., *primâ facie*, ought to be connected with each other and distinct from the rest of the Epistle.

It is, then, unsatisfactory to find that the commentators treat chapters v. and vi. as unconnected by any definite bond. "Verbindungslos" is Schmiedel's phrase. "The close of the last paragraph suggests a wholly different subject," says Lightfoot on chapter vi. 1. Stanley describes the beginning of chapter vi. as a "digression on the law-suits." And I do not find that any commentator treats chapter vi. as but the continuation of the argument of chapter v. Yet this I think we shall see is the simple fact, if we paraphrase chapters v.-vii. shortly:—

"I hear with sorrow that a thing which even the heathen do not tolerate has appeared among you. A man has been

guilty of sin with his stepmother. You do not feel the iniquity of this as you ought, and are puffed up with your spiritual condition (πεφυσιωμένοι, v. 2; οὐ καλὸν τὸ καύχημα ὑμῶν, v. 5). I, then, pass judgement on the man and ‘deliver him over to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that his spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.’ Put him out of your fellowship.

“I told you in a former letter not to associate with men of unclean life. Of course, you have to live in heathen society, and you will necessarily meet such people (τοῖς πόρνοις τοῦ κόσμου τούτου); I did not mean that you could avoid all dealings with them. But my point is that you must not keep company with *Christians* (cp. ἀδελφός, v. 11) who are habitual evil liverers in regard to sins of the flesh. To judge the heathen (τοὺς ἔξω) is for God, not for you. But you must judge members of the Christian society, and yourselves take cognizance of all such scandalous offenders as I am speaking of.

“It is intolerable that you should allow a case (πράγμα) of this kind to be tried before the heathen courts<sup>1</sup> (κρίνεσθαι ἐπὶ τῶν ἀδίκων, vi. 1; cp. vi. 6, ἀδελφὸς μετὰ ἀδελφοῦ κρίνεται, καὶ τοῦτο ἐπὶ ἀπίστων). The proper tribunal is a tribunal of the Church (vv. 2–5). Rather than drag such a case into the law courts it would be better for the injured party to endure the wrong that has been done him.

“I am sorry, indeed, to hear that various scandals of this kind have arisen in your midst, that husband and wife wrong (ἀδικεῖτε) each other and defraud (ἀποστερεῖτε) each other of what is due. Remember that evildoers of this kind shall not inherit the kingdom of God.

<sup>1</sup> The Roman law under which a prosecution for adultery would be made was the *Lex Julia de adulteriis*. It is probable, however, that native Greek law would be enforced at Corinth, and this also recognized adultery as an indictable offence, the damages being assessed by the judges.



“Marriage is lawful, but it is not always expedient ; some may choose to keep complete control over their own body (*οὐκ ἐγὼ ἐξουσιασθήσομαι ὑπὸ τινος*, vi. 12). In any case the body is not for unlawful lust ; you should glorify God in your body as well as in your spirit.

“Here comes in, then, the answer to your question about marriage and celibacy. Celibacy is ideally best, but monogamous marriage is lawful. Only let married persons remember that they have surrendered that complete control of their own bodies, of which I spoke (*ἡ γυνὴ τοῦ ἰδίου σώματος οὐκ ἐξουσιάζει, κτλ.*, vii. 4). They must not defraud each other of what is due (*μὴ ἀποστερεῖτε ἀλλήλους*, vii. 5), lest Satan tempt them to what is unlawful.”

The rest of St. Paul's answer as to the relative merits of celibacy and marriage need not detain us. But I submit that we obtain a quite clear view of the entire argument in chapters v., vi., and of the connexion between them, if we recognize that in vi. 1-11 the Apostle is speaking, not of the impropriety of Christians ever appearing before heathen tribunals (although much of what he says would apply generally), but of the impropriety of sins of infidelity and adultery among Christians being left to such tribunals ; *these* sins should be dealt with by Christian courts and judged by the Christian standards of purity, which are quite different from heathen standards. The principles upon which unchastity and the like are condemned by a Christian are the principles expounded in vi. 12-20, which would not be intelligible to a heathen. *Τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν μέλη Χριστοῦ ἐστίν.* That could not be urged in a heathen court ; but it goes to the root of the matter for a Christian. And accordingly St. Paul is indignant when he hears that a Christian man at Corinth has sought redress at the hands of the civil law for an offence which ought to be dealt with by the Christian law. Not only the son, but the father, is blameworthy—the son

for his abominable sin, the father for seeking the aid of heathen courts in his desire to punish him. Both father and son, it is clear, were Christians, for St. Paul's rebuke of both presupposes this; but the woman seems to have been a heathen, for nothing is said of the duty of the Christian community in regard to her future.

I have called attention above to the double occurrence of the word ἐξουσίαζειν, its significance in vi. 12 being made clear by its use in vii. 4, where the reference is not doubtful. So too ἀποστερείσθαι is a word of quite general application, but its meaning in vi. 8 seems to be fixed by its meaning in vii. 5. It means in both places "to be deprived of conjugal rights." Again ἄδικος, ἀδικεῖν, ἀδικεῖσθαι are, of course, common words for any kind of wrong-doers or unjust dealing; but the lists which are given in v. 10, 11, and vi. 9, 10 sufficiently shew the kind of sin which the Apostle has specially in his mind. Πλεονεξία may stand for any kind of self-aggrandisement or over-reaching of one's neighbour; but its use here is the same as in 1 Thessalonians iv. 6, τὸ μὴ ὑπερβαίνειν καὶ πλεονεκτεῖν ἐν τῷ πράγματι τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, where the πλεονεξία that is condemned is the violation of the honour of a home. My first point, then, is that the πράγματα (vi. 1) which St. Paul urges should be brought before a Christian tribunal and not left to heathen adjudicators are cases of adultery or the like; and that the ἀδίκια of which he speaks throughout chapter vi. is the wrong which is done when domestic honour is hurt, the whole discussion being strictly relevant to the scandal that had recently occurred in the Christian community at Corinth (v. 1).

This view of the argument requires us to believe that the father who was injured so grossly by his son's sin was alive at the time of that sin, and at the time of writing; for the burden of St. Paul's exhortation is that the father

ought not to have dragged such a case before the heathen courts. By so doing he might win his cause, no doubt ; but a Christian community ought to judge of the wrong done on quite different principles from those of civil rights, and ought to punish the offender by the severest of spiritual discipline and not by the mere assessment of damages. That the father was alive at the time of his son's sin made the sin even more shocking than it would have been had the woman been a widow. And the sentence which was to be passed was correspondingly severe. St. Paul directs the Corinthians *παραδοῦναι τὸν τοιοῦτον τῷ Σατανᾷ εἰς ὄλεθρον τῆς σαρκός*, a phrase which at any rate connotes excommunication from Christian privileges and Christian fellowship.

The meaning, however, of this sentence must be more closely examined. The purpose of the punishment to be inflicted was clearly remedial ; not only the purification of the community, but the amendment of the sinner, is in view, for the man was to be "delivered over to Satan," in order that his fleshly passions might be eradicated (*εἰς ὄλεθρον τῆς σαρκός*) and thus that "his spirit might be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus." The phrase *παραδοῦναι τῷ Σατανᾷ* occurs again in 1 Timothy i. 20, where St. Paul says that he has himself inflicted this punishment, i.e. of excommunication, upon the faithless and heretical Hymenaeus and Alexander, "in order that they may be taught not to blaspheme" ; in this passage, as in the one before us, the purpose of the sentence is not vindictive or punitive only, but remedial, for the ultimate benefit of the person punished. Certainly *παραδοῦναι τῷ Σατανᾷ* is a very strong phrase, but then St. Paul regarded the Kingdom of Christ and the Kingdom of Satan as exclusive. *Τίς συμφώνησις Χριστῷ πρὸς Βελίαρ* ; "What concord has Christ with Belial ?" is a question (2 Cor. vi. 15) to which his answer is not doubt-

ful. The force of the paragraph (2 Cor. vi. 14–vii. 1) depends entirely on this incompatibility of Christendom and heathendom. To “come out” from among the heathen was the only right course for a Christian man, and thus, conversely, to expel a man from the Christian society was to deliver him over to darkness and Belial.

We now proceed to inquire if the offender of 1 Corinthians v. 1, whose case suggested the discussion in 1 Corinthians v.–vi., is the same as the offender of 2 Corinthians ii. 5 f. and vii. 12 f. *Primâ facie* the two should be identified. *Entia non sunt multiplicanda præter necessitatem*, and an exegesis which has to presuppose incidents and disputes of which we know nothing can never be quite convincing, nor ought it to be preferred to an exegesis which limits itself to the data of the text. But to suppose—as some writers do—that in 2 Corinthians vii. 12 St. Paul is alluding to an insult or injury inflicted on himself by a member of the Corinthian Church, or to a quarrel between two Corinthians other than that arising out of 1 Corinthians vi. 1, is to introduce an hypothesis which cannot be justified *unless there is something in the language of the later passage inconsistent with the language of the former*. This is what we have to consider.

The first argument that is brought against the identification is that the injured person (ὁ ἀδικηθεὶς) of 2 Corinthians vii. 12 seems to have been alive at the time of writing, while it is urged that this presupposes a degree of wickedness on the part of the offender (ὁ ἀδικήσας) that is not contemplated in 1 Corinthians v. In the adultery case of 1 Corinthians v. it is assumed by many commentators, e.g. by Schmiedel (whose examination of these passages is very elaborate) that the father was dead. But of this there is no hint in St. Paul’s language. On the contrary, as I have pointed out above, the situation which had arisen pre-



supposes that the father was alive, for otherwise he could not have brought the case before the law courts. Once the connexion between 1 Corinthians v. and 1 Corinthians vi. is realized, we see that the father must have been alive at the time of writing; and thus there is no reason, so far as that goes, to prevent us from identifying him with *ὁ ἀδικήθεις* of 2 Corinthians vii. 12. The sin that is in question is as the sin of Reuben (Gen. xxxv. 22).

Further, it is noteworthy that the words *ἀδικήσας*, *ἀδικήθεις* of 2 Corinthians vii. 1, bring out exactly that aspect of the sin which is dwelt upon in 1 Corinthians vi. 7-9. It was that aspect of it which had caused the public scandal that is the object of St. Paul's solicitude. The father had, in the rôle of an "injured" party, gone before the heathen courts; whereas it was the duty of the Christian community to pass judgment in accordance with the distinctive principles of Christian purity. It was for this reason that the Apostle was so much relieved by the tidings which Titus brought him, viz., that the Corinthian Christians had acted on his direction and had taken the case into their own hands. They had proved themselves "pure" (2 Cor. vii. 11). The object of his intervention was not that he espoused the side of either party in this miserable litigation (*οὐχ ἕνεκεν τοῦ ἀδικήσαντος οὐδὲ ἕνεκεν τοῦ ἀδικηθέντος*, 2 Cor. vii. 12), but that he might awaken the Corinthian Church to a sense of what was due to itself and to him as its founder (*ἕνεκεν τοῦ φανερωθῆναι τὴν σπουδὴν ὑμῶν τὴν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ*, 2 Cor. vii. 12; cp. 2 Cor. ii. 9, *εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ ἔγραψα ἵνα γινῶ τὴν δοκιμὴν ὑμῶν, εἰ εἰς πάντα ὑπήκοοι ἐστέ*). He had written his rebuke not only that the offender might be reformed, but to test the acceptance by the Corinthians of his apostolic authority (cp. 1 Cor. v. 3, 4). Both from 1 Corinthians v. and from 2 Corinthians ii. and vii., it



is clear that the object of his indignation was rather the scandal to the Church caused by the sin and by the way in which it had been dealt with than the wrong done to the father by his wicked son. He is anxious that the Christian community should take cognizance of such offences, and judge them according to the principles of the Christian revelation. When he hears from Titus that this has been done he is rejoiced, and the measure of the punishment inflicted on the offender is a secondary matter.

This enables us, I submit, to meet the second objection which is urged against the identification of *ὁ ἀδίκησας* of 2 Corinthians vii. 12 with the sinful person of 1 Corinthians v. 1. It is said that the gentleness of St. Paul's language in 2 Corinthians ii. 5-11 is quite inconsistent with the heinousness of the offence described in the earlier Epistle. This argument was first put forward by Tertullian in his treatise, *De Pudicitia*. Tertullian is arguing, it must be remembered, in support of his severe view that sins of the flesh are unpardonable for Christians, and that repentance is more competent in such cases for heathens than for the baptized. It is essential to his position that he should refuse to identify the man whom St. Paul forgives in 2 Corinthians ii. and vii. with the man whose condemnation he directs in 1 Corinthians v. "Alius ergo erat, cui voluit sufficere increpationem; siquidem fornicator non increpationem de sententia eius retulerat, sed damnationem" (*De Pud.* 14).

No one is likely now to be convinced by Tertullian's reasoning, for it is no principle of Christian discipline—nor, despite Tertullian's vehemence, was the principle ever adopted by the Church—that severity must be unrelenting when the offender is penitent. The purpose of the excommunication ordered in 1 Corinthians v. 5 was remedial, so far as the offender was concerned; he was "to be de-

livered over to Satan . . . that his spirit might be saved in the day of the Lord." But if this punishment be not tempered with mercy, Satan may "get the better" both of offender and his judges (*ἵνα μὴ πλεονεκτηθῶμεν ὑπὸ τοῦ Σατανᾶ*, 2 Cor. ii. 11). The latter passage plainly points back to the former one, as the introduction of the thought of "Satan's devices" shews.

Apart, however, from this verbal correspondence, it seems to be impossible, unless we accept Tertullian's view, to refuse to identify the offender of 2 Corinthians ii. and vii. with the offender of 1 Corinthians v., on the score that the language of St. Paul in the later passage is the language of forgiveness and charity. The only difficulty is in the words of 2 Corinthians vii. 12: "Although I wrote to you, I wrote not for his cause that did the wrong, nor for his cause that suffered the wrong, but that your earnest care for us might be made manifest unto you in the sight of God." This, it may be said, is inconsistent with 1 Corinthians v., where certainly one of the causes of his writing was that the offender should be recovered. But it is a not infrequent idiom (it occurs in all literature) to speak of the less important or (for the moment) less prominent aspect of a transaction as if it were non-existent. The important object which St. Paul had in view when writing 1 Corinthians v., vi. was the stimulation of the Corinthian Church to take cognizance as a society of moral offences among its members. To assert its authority in such cases was, in a sense, to assert *his* authority, and he describes this here by a gentle periphrasis, "that your earnest care for us might be made manifest." This was the real motive of his letter, not at all that the offender should be punished (which was only a side issue) or that the aggrieved party should be satisfied.

The reason why this very unpleasant episode is worthy of careful examination is that upon the view which we take

of it depends the view which we take of the relation between the First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians ; and this again affects the question as to the integrity of the Second Epistle, which has been raised afresh in England of late years. I do not know that the connexion between chapters v. and vi. of the First Epistle has been suggested before, and it may be that even those who accept it will not accept the rest of the argument, which seems to me to favour the identification of the offender of 2 Corinthians ii., vii. with him of 1 Corinthians v. But such as it is, I offer it for examination.

J. H. BERNARD.

### *A SPECULATION IN TEXTUAL CRITICISM.*

IN the following pages I propose to discuss afresh the text of a passage in the Gospel of Luke which has given me personally a great degree of annoyance, on account of the extraordinary complexity of its attestation; I have returned to it again and again, in the hope of getting some clearer light upon it, by distrusting the rules that are drawn up for our guidance in such matters, and (though this must be said with bated breath and whispering humbleness) the rulers as well as the rules. But so far my despair has been chronic; nor has time helped to abate the disease by the discovery of any fresh factors in the evidence which may co-ordinate the divergent testimony and render that lucid which has hitherto been obscure.

I am alluding to the famous passage in Luke xiv. 5, where the critics have to decide whether they will read "a son or an ox" or "an ass or an ox," or some other of the many combinations of children, asses and oxen which occur in the MSS. and versions of the New Testament, representing the possible combinations of animated beings which are capable of falling into wells, and so of becoming the material for the establishment of the Christian doctrine of the Sabbath. Now, in order to avoid the dullness which naturally creeps over the subject of Textual Criticism when we confine ourselves to signs and symbols, numbers and letters of the alphabet, and do not look beneath them into the meaning of readings and combinations of readings, we propose to treat the subject something differently from what would be normal in works on the New Testament text, and without making what might be considered an orderly progress through the tangled wood of the conflicting

readings. Suppose we state the matter in its simplest possible form.

The Authorized Version of the Bible presents us in Luke xiv. 5 with the question :—

“ Which of you shall have an ass or an ox fallen into a pit, and will not straightway pull him out on the Sabbath day ? ”

The Revised Version, however, puts the matter a little differently : it retains substantially the Authorized rendering, with slight modifications of the English, but intimates on the margin the existence of a variant in the following words :—

Many ancient authorities read *a son*. See chap. xiii. 15. The suggested variant is to read *a son* for *an ass*, and the reference to Luke xiii. 15 is for a parallel passage in which the owner of an ox or an ass leads the animal to water on the Sabbath day. So that we may read between the lines and say that some Revisers would have liked to read *son* for *ass*, and intimated that the conjunction of *ox* and *ass* was a reflection from the previous chapter of the Gospel. Now, this is the problem in its simplest form, and as it stands, it is merely the habitual question in New Testament criticism, “ What are your working rules of criticism, and how do they apply in the present case ? ” Only the problem does not happen to be nearly as simple as it looks. There are other variant readings in existence, and there is also the difficulty of editing according to rules, when the rules appear to lead one into absurdities. For example, Scrivener, in his *Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament*, ed. iii. vol. ii. p. 305, opens the discussion of the passage as follows :—

“ Luke xiv. 5. Here again we have a strong conviction that *Ν*, though now in the minority, is more correct than *Β*, supported as the latter is by a dense array of witnesses



of every age and country. In the clause *τίνος ὑμῶν ὄνος ἡ βοῦς* of the Received Text all the critical editors substitute *υἱός* for *ὄνος*, which introduces a bathos so tasteless as to be almost ludicrous." Then he adds a footnote against those who would get rid of the bathos by free translation, to the effect that

"To enable us to translate, 'a son, nay even an ox,' would require *ἡ καὶ*, which none read. The argument, moreover, is one *a minori ad majus*. Compare Exod. xxi. 33 with Exod. xxiii. 4; ch. xiii. 15."

The question at once arises in our minds, is the bathos real, and may we avoid a bathos by deserting a "dense array of witnesses of every age and country," including the famous Vatican Codex (B), and nearly all the other copies? I can quite imagine that, in face of such a combination, almost all critics would either deny the bathos and follow the critical text, or allow the bathos and still follow the consensus of the critical editors. In passing we may remark that in all probability the bathos is over-estimated; it is not "as deep as a grave." The conjunction of sons with oxen is not so impossible in Biblical times as it might be thought to-day: when children were chattels, they might fall into wells with cattle, and not outrage the canons of literary taste. However, let the bathos stand for what it is worth (for it is clear that all the MSS. in the world would not outweigh the aesthetic instincts of the Revisers in the matter), and then the problem for us is the textual one: ought we to follow the Sinaitic text with a handful of supporting authorities against the Vatican text and the main body of the witnesses? That is a pretty situation; very different from what we sometimes have to face, viz., B with Dr. Hort against all the rest of the world; this time it is B with nearly all the MSS. and all the editors against the Revisers.

But the textual problem is not as simple as it looks, for these are not all the variations, and as a right solution explains the aberrant readings as well as establishes the correct reading (for when the cause of the variant is known, the variant itself disappears), we must ask for at least an informal statement as to what other variations exist in the critical apparatus. Accordingly we have

- (1) A son or an ox.
- (2) An ass or an ox.
- (3) An ox or an ass.
- (4) A mountain or an ox.
- (5) A son or an ox or an ass.
- (6) A sheep or an ox.

Of these, No. 4 is only a scribe's blunder, writing ὄρος (a mountain) for ὄνος (an ass). No. 5 is an obvious conflation. No. 3 is an equally obvious inversion; and when these three are removed, we have three readings left, viz.,

- (1) A son or an ox (B).
- (2) An ass or an ox (N).
- (3) A sheep or an ox (D).

We have added the leading attesting witness in each case, and the third one acquires especial importance because it is the reading of the Codex Bezae (D), which has πρόβατον in the Greek and *ovis* in the Latin. On the theory of the bathos or, if you prefer it, the softening of the harder reading, we should have to assume that the Sinaitic or Bezan readings are independent attempts to get rid of the troublesome *son*. And it is usual to call Synoptic criticism and the parallel passages elsewhere into court in order to explain the sources from which the second and third readings are derived. Thus, the Sinaitic reading is supposed to have been assimilated to Luke xiii. 15, and the Bezan reading to Matthew xii. 11. In the latter case we are told of a man who has a single sheep, which falls

into a pit on the Sabbath day ; and it is inferred that this is the sheep which, according to the Bezan text, fell into the pit on the Sabbath day. The explanations given are possible, but not satisfactory. They have not satisfied the critics, who have tried to deduce the variants (or at least one of them) more immediately from what they have taken to be the true text. Thus Mill, to whom we must presently refer, thought that "sheep" was a textual corruption of *son*, or rather, conversely, "son" was a corruption of "sheep"; and I believe I was once responsible for a reduction of *ovis* from *bovis*, with a Latin reaction on the Greek text of the Codex Bezae, thus making the "sheep" a corruption of the "ox." As Mill's argument, though brief, is critically important, I proceed to examine it. It will be found in the *Prolegomena* to his New Testament (col. xlv.) as follows :—

"Τίνος ὕμῶν ὅς ἢ βοῦς. *Cant*, ut liquet ex ejus Latinis : *cujus ex vobis ovis aut bovis*. Verum diu est, cum originaria ista Graeca perierunt. Ex ὅς factum a scribis posterioribus νίος quod in Codices multos transiit. Tandem vero a quopiam, cui haud congruum visum erat, ut *filius* et *bos* hic conjungerentur, parique quasi passu incederent, mutatum νίος in ὄνος maxime quod alias in hoc Evangelio conjunctim legantur, c. 13. v. 15."

Mill's theory is that the *sheep* was the original animal of the text, but the sheep in a Homeric form (ὄις), not the πρόβατον of Codex Bezae.

It certainly required some hardihood to introduce a Homeric and poetical form into the text of the New Testament. And to get rid of πρόβατον and insert its archaic form was a triumph of ingenuity. It will be observed in passing that Mill felt, with Scrivener and others, the apparent incongruity of yoking *a son* and *an ox* together ! The merit of Mill's conjecture lay in its paleography : it

is well known that, in early MSS., there is a confusion between the transcription of **OI** and **Y** when **OI** is a diphthong ; and since it is common in MSS. of an early type to abbreviate **YIOC** into **YC**, the transition from **OIC** to **YIOC** became a possibility, if only the scribes would make the mistakes that they were wanted to. If Mill were right, the Codex Bezae (in its Latin and not in its Greek) becomes the primary authority for the determination of the text.

It is to this statement of Mill that Scrivener, as I suppose, refers, when he remarks that "**YC** or **OIC** mistaken for the contraction for **YIOC** is a mere guess, and we are safest here in clinging to common sense against a preponderance of outward evidence." We agree that it is a mere guess, and believe that in the solution of the problem, common sense may have the last word, but not perhaps to the extent of throwing so much evidence overboard as the MSS. furnish for the reading *son*.

Moreover, if common sense is to be invoked, the appeal might be made higher up. For it might be asked whether it is not as easy to employ that faculty to explain all the readings, as to establish a preference for one reading against the rest.

Suppose, then, we ask whether a reason can be imagined in the nature of things why so many animated beings should be tumbling into wells ; can we devise a situation from which the accident can be evolved for them all, either in a single event, as in the "one sheep" of Matthew, or in a dual manner, the ox being one of the members of the combination in the latter case ? If we have the animals grouped in pairs disjunctively, why should one member of the combination be fixed and the other variable ? Obviously, the natural suggestion is that the other member of the combination was objected to. The theory of literary erasure of a bathos is insufficient, as we have already seen.

What animal can have occupied the first place in the combination? We suggest that the original reading was *pig*, and that, for obvious reasons, it was felt that the pig was out of place in the saying of Jesus, and was removed by various substitutions. Such a supposition would at once explain why we have the variants *ass or ox* and *sheep or ox*. But the remaining case, *son or ox*, requires a more careful examination. In the first place, the two words ὕC and ὕΙΟC are very nearly isophonous (*hys* and *hyios*); in the next place, they are almost exact paleographical equivalents. For example, there is a story told of Herod the Great by Macrobius in his *Saturnalia*,<sup>1</sup> that when Augustus had heard that amongst the children of two years old and under, whom Herod had commanded to be slain, his own son was included, he (Augustus) remarked that it was better to be Herod's pig than his son. Here Macrobius has mixed up the account of the Massacre of the Innocents with the general barbarity of Herod, of which his own family were so often the victims. There is no reason why we should accept Macrobius' suggestion that there was any connexion between the murder, say, of Antipater or any other of the royal household, and the legend in Matthew. But the jest about the ὕς and the υἱός must be original; it came from the Greek, and must have been Augustus' own. From this it is sufficiently clear that if *swine* and *son* are near enough to make puns on in Greek, they are near enough for one to be the correction of the other in a written document.

But suppose we come to actual MSS. evidence, and examine what paleography has to say on the subject.

There is a famous passage in one of the Psalms which appears in our English text as follows:—

<sup>1</sup> Macrobius, *l.c.* ii. 4.



Psalm xvii. 14. "They are full of children, and leave the rest of their substance to their babes."

Now, let us see how the editors of the Septuagint present this passage. They print it as follows :—

ἐχορτάσθησαν υἱέων  
καὶ ἀφήκαν τὰ κατάλοιπα τοῖς νηπίοις αὐτῶν.

The form *υἱέων* is startling ; it is the reading of both the Sinaitic and Vatican Codices ; it tells us that the wicked are "full of *pig-meats*," instead of "satisfied with children," which the Hebrew shows to be the correct meaning. The Alexandrian MS. has the correct *υἱῶν* (*sons*), but another important MS. actually reads *υῶν* (*pigs*). It is surprising that editors should present a text which they know cannot be that of the original Septuagint, but with that we are not concerned. What is clear from the passage in the Psalm is that the forms *υῖς* and *υἱός* readily pass into one another. The case will be even stronger when we reflect that in the early uncial MSS. it is common to abbreviate the word *υἱός*, and write it in the *Υ̅C* form, with a bar over the word to intimate the abbreviation. When the word is written in this way, the difference between *son* and *pig* is nil, except for the mark of abbreviation. Neglect that, and you can read which you please, with a preference for *pig*.

We have now shown that from the side of literature and from that of the science of diplomatics, the confusion between *son* and *pig* is in the nature of things. It hardly requires a deliberate intention to exchange one for the other. And we have now found a common sense origin for the conflicting variants. They are due to the existence of the reading *pig* or *ox* in the early history or antecedents of the Gospel of Luke. But it may still be maintained that *son* is the original, for the hypothesis merely asserts

that two words are nearly equivalent. We have not yet finally settled which has the priority. Shall we then say that it was a scribal error to write *pig* for *son*, and that then two independent corrections have been made, which we find in the Sinaitic and Bezan MSS. respectively? At first sight this looks a possible hypothesis, but it will not bear scrutiny. One single reason will perhaps suffice. The Codex Bezae says, Write *sheep* for *pig*, and let the sheep fall into the well. But this is what happens in the related passage in Matthew, which shows the saying of Christ about the treatment of animals on the Sabbath in a variant form, which has also to be accounted for. The natural conclusion is that the *pig* stood in the sources both of Matthew and of Luke. And we may give the priority to the *pig* because it will explain both the textual and Synoptic phenomena.

And now we begin to find ourselves in difficulties outside the region of textual criticism. How could Jesus have spoken of an Israelite as owning a pig? The pig is taboo, apparently from the earliest times. Would it have been assumed, even in conversation, that the hostile critic was a law-breaker of the first order, and that he had forgotten the animal which practically stood at the head of the list of taboos, which declares that these are they that shall be unclean unto you.

Moreover, we know from Luke himself in another passage that our Lord regarded the feeding of swine as a degradation, and represented the Prodigal Son of his discourse as falling into that degradation in a far country. Is it not involved in this parable that the pig is not a home animal, nor the care of him a worthy occupation?

And, last of all, when Luke speaks of pigs, he does not use the word *ἵς*, but the alternative *χοῖρος*. And the word *ἵς* is only found in the New Testament in the pro-

verbial passage in 2 Peter, where the pig goes to the bath first and to the mire afterwards.

Now, of these objections, the last can most readily be disposed of. It is not necessary to suppose that it is Luke's own word ; nor is there any reason to suppose that the word *ῥς* was not current at this period. The jest of Augustus has already come before us. In Egypt we find an official tax on pigs which is called *ῥικη*.

But the difficulty as to the possession of a pig by a pious or, at all events, a respectable Israelite, is more difficult to meet.

But what do we know as to the actual prevalence of the swine taboo in our Lord's time ? Was it universal ? We know what it is to-day, the most beneficent of all Moslem superstitions, only broken by a few German immigrants at Haifa, who leave the sacred animal to wander about their filthy streets, to the great discomfort of the tourist. But it is certain that no such systematic taboo existed in our Lord's time as prevails under Islam. The Gadarenes are in evidence for that. And not only are they in evidence for the existence of swine in the north of Palestine ; the number in the herd shows that they must have been a marketable commodity, and the markets must have been found where the people were found, that is, in the cities bordering on the lake of Galilee. Gadara also disposes of the suggestion that if a man wanted, or was forced against his liking, to feed swine, he must go into a far country to do it. The prodigal went into a far country for pleasure and freedom ; if the action had turned merely on swine-herding, he need not have gone very far afield. Moreover, it is clearly impossible to assume that the single herd of swine mentioned in the Gospels was the only one in the country. If the numbers attributed to the herd seem large enough to suggest a syndicate, we must remember that we are

before the days of trusts, and that one syndicate will not control the industry. There must have been many small holders for one syndicate. So the natural and legitimate conclusion is that we have underestimated the extent to which swine and swine-feeding prevailed in Galilee in our Lord's time. And this practically removes the objection to the reading which we have tried to restore, and leaves common sense, to which Dr. Scrivener appealed, master of the situation.

J. RENDEL HARRIS.

*THE COMMENTARY OF PELAGIUS ON THE  
EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL.*

IN the fourth century of our era, England, the Roman province of Britain, was divided into two well marked parts. The northern and western parts were occupied only by troops, but the eastern and southern lowlands contained nothing but purely civilian life.<sup>1</sup> The former districts were the scene of camps, the latter of towns and villas. The civilian part was thoroughly Romanized. The language of the people was Latin, and had been so for about two centuries, as the evidence provided by the excavations at Silchester shows. Latin was the official language ; Latin was also the spoken language. As the greatest authority on this subject, Dr. Haverfield, puts it, " Latin was employed freely in the towns of Britain, not only on serious occasions, or by the upper classes, but by servants and workpeople for the most accidental purposes. It was also used, at least by the upper classes, in the country." <sup>2</sup> The same is true with regard to the civilization in general : all the evidence points to the fact that the earlier trades and arts succumbed to the conquering Roman influence.

The third and first half of the fourth centuries were periods of progressive prosperity, but about 350 the decline of Roman influence began, and in 406 or 407 Britain, much to its regret, was severed from Rome. Before this happened, however, the long process of Romanization had culminated, as it might have been expected to culminate, in the production of a great writer, and this great writer was, like all the really great writers of the third and succeeding centuries in the West, a Christian. The Church had followed

<sup>1</sup> Haverfield, *Romanization of Roman Britain* (Lond. [1906],) p. 8.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 11.



the march of Roman civilization ever since the days of St. Paul; there had been settled Christian communities in Britain from the end of the third century at latest; and now one of the sons of the British Church was to raise a controversy by which the Christian thought of all succeeding ages has been affected.

It has been debated whether Pelagius was a citizen of the Roman Empire, belonging to the province of Britain, or an Irishman. The former view seems more probable, if we take all the circumstances into account; and the term 'Irishman' as applied to him was doubtless the offspring of the contempt and hatred of his enemies, the Irish being amongst the destroyers of Roman civilization in Britain. Another explanation of the term is to suppose that he was descended from Irish settlers in Somerset or Devonshire or Cornwall or the south-west coast of Wales; he could thus very well be called either *Brito* (a Briton) or *Scottus* (an Irishman).

But whether Briton or Irishman, he appears to have found his way to Rome in the closing years of the fourth century. We may suppose that he was animated by a thirst for learning, was possessed of considerable private means, and was naturally drawn to the centre of things. On arriving at Rome, he began to live the life of a monk. He lived simply and purely, and mainly occupied himself with the study of the Bible; and of the Bible his favourite portion appears to have been the Epistles of Paul. He conceived the idea of writing and publishing a commentary on these Epistles, and it is with the fortunes of this commentary rather than its character that I wish to deal in this paper.

There is a little difficulty in understanding why he should have chosen to write a commentary on this part of Scripture specially. There was in existence a commentary which had been published anonymously some twenty or thirty

years before, a commentary which still exists, and has earned the title of the best on these Epistles prior to the Reformation. One possible reason for the plan of Pelagius may have lain in the very fact that this commentary, now commonly called "Ambrosiaster," was anonymous. But whether this was a reason or not, there appear to have been two certain reasons for his action, apart from it. The first was that the "Ambrosiaster" commentary, brief as it is, is bulky in the mass: the second that it was based on a form of Latin Bible which was in ordinary use in Rome a generation before Pelagius' day, but had been to some extent superseded by that revision of the Latin New Testament text, which Jerome had undertaken at the request of Pope Damasus and issued in the years 383-384. This revision is what we now know as the "Vulgate." Pelagius chose, then, the Vulgate text, and wrote very brief comments on it, and after completing it, had it issued in Rome, the great book mart of the world, somewhat before the year 410. From there it circulated all over the Western Empire, and was hailed with pride by his fellow-countrymen.

At first it appears to have attracted little attention, but gradually it made its way by its merit. It fell under the eyes of the famed Augustine, bishop of Hippo in the North of Africa, who was greatly struck by a remark of the author, when dealing with Romans v. 12, "Therefore, as through one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin; and so death passed unto all men, for that all sinned," that children do not carry original sin. It seemed to him so self-evident from this passage that they did that he set himself to refute the statement of Pelagius, and the quiet monk awoke to find himself notorious. East and West took part in the discussion, which was led by some of the foremost minds of the age.

As Professor Bury well remarks <sup>1</sup>: "Pelagianism is not

<sup>1</sup> *Life of St. Patrick*, p. 43 ff.

one of those dull, lifeless heresies which have no more interest than the fact that they once possessed for a short space the minds of men a long while dead. . . . The assertion of the freedom of the will by Pelagius, and his denial of innate sin, represent a reaction of the moral consciousness against the dominance of the religious consciousness, and although he speaks within the Church, he is really asserting the man against the Christian." The view of Pelagius has a real interest for us in the present day, and most of us have moods in which we are tempted to think that he was right. However, the leaders of the Church in the fifth century mostly wrote and worked against it, and the author was eventually excommunicated.

The poet Horace has pithily said: *nescit vox missa reverti*, "a word once uttered cannot be unsaid." The author might be excommunicated, but copies of the book had been multiplied by scribes. It was valued in all quarters of the Latin Empire. How was the Church to retain and use the commentary without seeming to be in league with the author and his detested opinions? There were two, or rather three, ways out of this difficulty. One was to leave it anonymous, if it was so issued. Another was to erase the author's name from copies which bore it, and make it anonymous. A third was to put the name of an unimpeachable, an "orthodox," author upon it.

The number of anonymous copies still existing is a matter of considerable doubt as yet, and some anonymous commentaries on Paul's Epistles in European libraries, which I suspect may be Pelagius, have not hitherto been examined. About one only has practical certainty been reached, that it is a pure form of the original commentary.

There is, however, sufficient evidence of the employment of the other method of preserving commentaries written by heretics. Already in the fifth century the com-

mentary was circulating, by the strange irony of history, under the name of St. Jerome, one of the bitterest opponents of its author. Of this recension there exist at least eleven complete manuscripts, three or four as old as the ninth century, and a number of fragmentary manuscripts, two of which are as old as the ninth century. Little of the objectionable opinions of the author appears to have been eradicated from this form. This makes one suspect that the attribution to Jerome may have been made in good faith, because the commentary was on the Vulgate text, which Jerome made.

The history of this form in print is of some interest. The first printed edition appeared at Basle in 1516, under the editorship of Amorbach. In the preface he tells us that the one manuscript from which he printed it was in "Gothic" (by which he probably meant what we call Merovingian) characters, which through age had almost faded away. This manuscript I have been unable to trace. The results of its use are apparent to every reader of the printed text. It simply bristles with corruptions, such as *mansuetudo* (gentleness) where *consuetudo* (custom) is what the author really wrote.<sup>1</sup> Nor has any real advance been made in subsequent editions. The work was not Jerome; what was worse, it was the production of a heretic: it was hardly worth printing; but if it was to be printed, let it be relegated to an appendix, where nobody would read it; and take no trouble about making it readable by purifying it of textual error. Nothing was done to purify the text till the year 1901, when Professor Zimmer, of Berlin, a distinguished Celtic scholar, to whom these studies are much

<sup>1</sup> In 2 Cor. xi. 28. The reader should try what he can make of the comments on verses 9 and 10 of the same chapter (Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* xxx. 834 D, 835 A of the reprint).



indebted, published a collation of a St. Gall MS., from which hundreds of corrections were obtained.

So silly are some of the attributions of particular works to particular writers that we ought not to be greatly surprised that in the sixth century the name of Gelasius, an orthodox Pope, was sometimes affixed to it. Of this attribution, however, no trace now remains in MSS.

When and where the attribution to Primasius originated it is not possible to say with certainty; nor can we even say as yet what the original form of that recension is. It appears to exist in two manuscripts only, and these have yet to be examined. Primasius, bishop of Hadrumetum, in North Africa, in the sixth century, is a person of some note. He helped to keep the lamp of Christianity and Christian learning burning in that region in the period just before both were extinguished by the advancing hordes of barbarism. He was a leader of Christian opinion, whose advice was in considerable request, and he wrote a commentary on the Apocalypse, which is mainly a compilation from the works of his predecessors. It has attracted considerable attention in recent years, because an early African text of that book can be recovered from it. By common consent, however, Primasius is not regarded as really having had anything to do with the commentary on the Epistles of Paul, which Gagney edited in 1537, and which has since been several times reprinted. A critical examination of this commentary shows that it is based mainly on Pelagius, but that the passages which reflected that author's special opinions have been removed and in their places appear passages of his opponents Augustine and Jerome. It is of some interest to inquire where this mutilation and amplification occurred, and in doing so we shall have to make acquaintance with one of the most remarkable figures of the sixth century.



The preservation of early Christian books is due more to Cassiodorus than to any other man before the age of printing. One of the most distinguished statesmen of his day in Rome, he had a passion for education. After he had held the high position of Prime Minister to Theodoric, he retired to South Italy when sixty years of age, in or about the year 540. There he founded the monastery of Vivaria, as a seminary for the training of clergy. He has left us a description of the valuable library of the institution, which his knowledge, taste and high position enabled him to acquire. Amongst the treasures were many copies of Scripture and a complete set of all the Latin commentaries on the sacred text which up to that time had been written. Undoubtedly it is to him, ultimately, that we owe the best existing copy of the Vulgate Bible. It was copied in England at Wearmouth or Jarrow at the beginning of the eighth century directly or indirectly from a copy in this library of Cassiodorus, and has now found, after some curious wanderings, a resting place in the Laurentian Library at Florence.

Amongst the commentaries on Scripture in the library at Vivaria was that of Pelagius on the Epistles of Paul. Cassiodorus, as an inflexible Augustinian, could not allow the commentary to remain as it was. So he carefully worked through the part on Romans and purged it of its heresy, at the same time "stiffening" it with passages of contrary tendency from the great Latin authors. Having shown the way, he left the purification of the commentary on the other Epistles to his pupils.

This we learn from Cassiodorus himself, and Mr. C. H. Turner is possibly right in drawing the inference that the commentary which we possess under the name Primasius is actually that which Cassiodorus and his pupils prepared on the basis of the Pelagius commentary. The character of

the Primasius commentary corresponds exactly with what Cassiodorus tells us of the proceedings of himself and his pupils, and, as might be expected, the work of the pupils is much more perfunctory than that of the master. The very attribution to Primasius is a confirmation of Mr. Turner's view. Such attributions, as we have seen, are very often foolish, but there is one characteristic they have which is useful. Oftener than not they guess the wrong author, but they generally hit the right period, and this case is no exception to that rule. Cassiodorus and Primasius were contemporaries. The attributor recognized the work to be a sixth century production. He knew only one sixth century commentator, namely, Primasius; so he attributed it to him. Cassiodorus and his pupils had, of course, issued the commentary anonymously.

I have now brought the strange and eventful history of this commentary on the Continent down to the close of the sixth century, but if this were all that could be said, the story would lose half its interest. The Church had done its work of suppression so effectually on the Continent that not a single copy of the commentary is now left with the real author's name attached to it. But such copies did exist, and it was in Ireland and Ireland only that they were to be found. The discovery of the history of Pelagius' commentary in Irish circles is inseparably connected with the name of Heinrich Zimmer, of Berlin, who has unravelled it.

We have seen that on publication the commentary was despatched all over the Western world in the first decade of the fifth century. Amongst the countries which received copies was the Roman Province of Britain. Almost immediately after its reception by his gratified fellow-countrymen, the Roman troops were withdrawn from Britain, which was speedily overrun by the barbarians and closed to influences from the Continent. For a hundred and fifty

years or more the Church grew up in Ireland, (431 onwards) entirely independent of the Church on the Continent. It used the books it had got before the severance. It revered Pelagius as much as Augustine. It kept Easter at the old date, long after it had been given up by the Continental Church. In fact it developed a vigorous life of its own, independent of Christianity elsewhere, and based on the Christianity of the first four centuries. It was probably at first quite innocent of the storm which Pelagius had raised on the Continent, but it continued to follow his doctrines even after it had learned about it. It possessed, used and copied the commentary of that author, with his name attached to it.

I will now as briefly as I can detail the evidence for this knowledge and use of Pelagius' commentary in Ireland. The collection of Irish Canons, dating from the beginning of the eighth century, quotes from Pelagius exactly as it does from Jerome and Augustine : *Pelagius ait, Hieronymus ait, Augustinus ait*. The New Testament part of the book of Armagh, written in the year 807, contains prologues to the Epistles of Paul and a general prologue to all, all with the name of Pelagius. These are the same prologues as have been stolen without acknowledgement and attributed to Jerome in many Continental MSS. of the Vulgate. Again, a famous manuscript at Würzburg, in Bavaria, (*M. th. f. 12*), dating from the seventh or eighth century, and containing the Epistles of Paul in Latin in an Irish handwriting, contains, in addition to a number of glosses in the old Irish language, some nine hundred Latin glosses from Pelagius' commentary, with the symbol *Pil*, an Irish contraction for Pelagius, attached. In a manuscript formerly at Metz, and now at Berlin, in a handwriting of the eleventh century, are to be found glosses labelled in the same way. So in a manuscript of Ratisbon, now at Vienna, of the same date.

The Irish Church led a progressive existence until the beginning of the ruinous Danish invasions. The destruction of monasteries and libraries caused by these raiders drove the Irish in despair from their Ireland to seek homes on the Continent. They took their beloved books with them, and settled at numerous points from the North of France along the Rhine valley, right to Bavaria on the one hand, and North Italy on the other. The manuscripts I have just mentioned are all of Irish origin, as the places they come from or the script in which they are written show. The Irish missionaries gave back to Europe the learning which they had received from her centuries before. They were pioneers of Christianity, education and civilization. They circulated the commentary of their distinguished countryman under his own name, and all traces of it that can be recovered with the author's name can readily be connected with Irish transmission. There is further evidence of great interest.

There are some ages which are better employed in utilizing and making accessible the knowledge of previous ages than in producing original work. The ninth century is notable as an age of compilation. Zmaragdus, abbot of the Benedictine Monastery at St. Mihiel in the Vosges country, in the early years of the ninth century, conceived and executed the plan of a commentary on the passages of Scripture appointed to be read in Church on various Feast days and Sundays. He did not attempt to write a commentary of his own on these lessons of Scripture, but, being a man of learning, he extracted comments from the great writers of the Church, with or without abbreviating them. And this he did not without acknowledgement. He borrowed a system which was perhaps inaugurated, and certainly practised, by our own countryman Bede, and in the margin affixed to each extract the first letter or letters of the name of the author extracted.



In his preface he names as his authorities fifteen Latin writers, two Greek Fathers, and also, as requiring to be read with caution, Pelagius and Origen. Amongst those used Pelagius appears with great frequency, the extracts from him being labelled with the letter *P* in most cases. This exposition of the Lectionary was printed at Strassburg in 1536, and reprinted at Paris in 1851. The printed edition is far from satisfactory, but happily there are in existence a dozen or so manuscripts not far removed in date from Zmaragdus himself, which make it possible to restore the *ipsissima verba* of his compilation.

It ought, perhaps, to be mentioned that this great work of Zmaragdus has been unworthily neglected by scholars. The copies of the great Christian authors which he possessed must have been at least as old as the eighth century, and may have been much older. He is, therefore, a valuable witness to the text, not only of Pelagius, but of Augustine, Ambrose, Jerome and others. He appears even to have known a work of Origen on the Epistle to the Hebrews. A pressing need of patristic scholarship is a critical edition of Zmaragdus' Exposition, with all the extracts tracked to their original sources.

I have mentioned that he knew and used the commentary of Pelagius under its author's name. As Zmaragdus cannot be shown to have had any connexion with Ireland, this fact may seem to contradict my statement that Ireland alone preserved the commentary under its author's name. In reality it does not contradict it. An examination of the transcriptional errors in the quotations from Pelagius has shown me that his copy of Pelagius was written in Irish handwriting, and Zmaragdus thus falls into line with the Irish tradition.

Before going on to mention other compilations of the ninth century in which our commentary was used, I must



not forget a very important historical fact. The catalogues of three monastic libraries on the Continent, dating from the ninth and tenth centuries, show that these libraries each possessed in those centuries a copy of Pelagius under his own name. The libraries were at St. Riquier, near Abbeville, in Picardy, Lorsch on the Rhine, and St. Gall, near the Lake of Constance in Switzerland. All three places were on the direct line of Irish missionary travel on the Continent, and there can be no doubt that they owed their copies of Pelagius to the Irish. It is not certain that any of those three manuscripts still survives, though Zimmer believes that he has discovered the St. Gall one at St. Gall.

Apparently about the same time as Zmaragdus was working, another compiler made a commentary on all the Epistles of Paul by a similar method. It is uncertain who the compiler was. The commentary is sometimes attributed to Haymo (of Halberstadt), sometimes to Remigius (of Auxerre), and both attributions occur in ninth century MSS.; of which there are three, two crediting it to Haymo, one to Remigius. Whether the compiler possessed a pure text of Pelagius or the Pseudo-Primasius form only, is at present uncertain.

There is no such uncertainty about another compilation of the same century. Sedulius, a learned Irishman, whose sphere of activity was the Rhine valley, put together a commentary on the Epistles of Paul. He names Pelagius at least once, and extracts his commentary throughout. The date of his activity was about the middle of the ninth century. It appears to me that he sometimes used what Zmaragdus had collected before him, as well as the Pelagius and other ancient commentaries themselves.

The remaining evidence for the existence of the commentary under the name of its author can be very briefly related. A Munich MS. of the Epistles of Paul, contemporary

with the Berlin one already mentioned, i.e. belonging to the end of the eleventh century, contains glosses from Pelagius, who is named; as does also a thirteenth century MS. at Berne. In the same century a deacon of Verona, named John, mentions that he had seen a copy of the commentary with the author's name.

Later than this there appears no trace of it; and I must now briefly state how I think the commentary can be restored to its original form. The primary task is to collate such anonymous MSS. as may exist, then the Pseudo-Jerome MSS. and then those of Pseudo-Primasius. When this has been done, the editor has, in what is common to all, the commentary in a reasonably exact form. He must then collate MSS. of Zmaragdus, Haymo-Remigius and Sedulius, and note the form of the Pelagian extracts in these, as compared with those in his chief sources. Lastly, he must collect from the glossed manuscripts the clauses and sentences to be found there.

The task is long and difficult, but appears to be worth attempting. I hope that success will follow the attempt. The work of Zimmer already mentioned, and that of Hellmann, entitled *Sedulius Scottus* (Munich, 1906), have, in sifting the materials of Irish *provenance*, made a beginning which is very helpful to the investigator. The present writer is seeking to carry on the work, and expects to publish an edition of the Pelagius Commentary, with introductory essays, in the Cambridge *Texts and Studies relating to Biblical and Patristic Literature*, edited by the Dean of Westminster.

ALEX. SOUTER.

## *DISTINCTIONS OF EXTERNAL FUNCTION IN THE HOLY TRINITY.*

THE purpose of this paper is to offer a slight contribution towards that branch of theology which is concerned with the distinctions of external function within the Holy Trinity. No attempt will be made to explain this distinction in terms of philosophy. The scriptural data and their patristic treatment will be more than sufficient material for our present study, and here again our investigation must be limited to those passages in which the three Persons of the Holy Trinity are mentioned together with reference to their work in the world.

1. Let us take first 1 Corinthians xii. 4 foll. There are *διαίρέσεις χαρισμάτων*, but the same Spirit; *διαίρέσεις διακονιῶν*, but the same Lord; *διαίρέσεις ἐνεργημάτων*, but the same God, *ὁ ἐνεργῶν τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν*. The *χαρίσματα* here assigned to the Spirit as His work are the specific endowments for Christian service enumerated in the next verses; the *διακόνιαι* are not services rendered to Christ and His members, but types of ministry commissioned by Him as the one Lord; the *ἐνεργήματα* are not merely miracles, but all spiritual powers in exercise,—in the words of Bishop Andrewes' sermon on this passage "the effect of work done, wrought or executed by the former two, the skill of the gift and the power of the calling." The *διαίρέσεις* that exist within each of these three categories are, as the history of the word suggests and as the context shows, a matter not of essential character but of providential distribution. The gifts, offices and works are as a matter of fact different in themselves, but the point is that they are assigned to different persons. They are the manifold exhibition or provision of the one divine purpose.

But this one divine purpose is itself threefold in its working. There was grave need at Corinth of mutual recognition and harmony among the possessors of these various gifts for service. To meet this need the Apostle lays stress, not only upon the unity of the divine economy of spiritual powers, but also upon the distinctions within the divine operation. The recipients of these different gifts are to be one in their distinctive exercise of the gifts just as the three persons of the Holy Trinity are one in their distinctive functions in the bestowal of the gifts. The order in which these functions are stated is determined, as St. Basil notes, by the standpoint of the recipient of the gifts. The Spirit comes first as the immediate imparters of the gifts, the Son next as the sender, the Father last as the source. The Spirit is the immediate source of active life, the Son is the channel of all ordered authority, the Father is the ultimate source of all effective power. *Δύναμις, ἐξουσία, ἐνεργεία*,—such would seem to be an apt triad of terms to express the distinction of Father, Son and Spirit, but for the fact that the verb *ἐνεργεῖν* is actually used in this passage both of the Father and of the Spirit. In other words, the function assigned to the Father is not merely a distinctive function of His own, it is a comprehension of all the activities that flow from His own. The Father is *ὁ ἐνεργῶν τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν*, the Spirit *πάντα ταῦτα ἐνεργεῖ διαιροῦν ἰδίᾳ ἐκάστῳ καθὼς βούλεται*. Is it hyperexegetical to distinguish *τὰ πάντα*, the scheme of spiritual powers as a whole, from *πάντα ταῦτα*, the different powers regarded in particular? If it is a permissible distinction, then within the one *ἐνεργεία* we have the all-bracing providence of the Father and the particular application of the Spirit. Even then the one includes the other.

A similar co-operation is to be noted in the subsequent passage on the members of the one body. Bengel suggests that the remainder of the chapter falls under the respective



heads of the one Spirit, the one Lord, the one God. But the second of these three sections, though it is the body of Christ which is being described, is largely occupied with the parable of the human body, and here it is God ( $\delta$  Θεός) who assigns to each member its place. In fact across the distinction of functions so clearly marked for the Son and the Spirit there comes the complementary truth of that unity of the divine operation which is seen in the very description of the first person not as the Father but as God.

2. The next passage to consider is the concluding benediction of 2 Corinthians. Here we have not the precise statement of the doctrine of divine operation, but the rich tones of an apostolic prayer. It is the theology not of instruction, but of intercession; but it is still theology. Here again is the idea of distinctive operation, not now in the work of the Church but in the life of the members. The change of order again is appropriate,—it is the order of Christian experience. First comes the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the preaching of the Gospel of the Incarnation,—in words that recall the earlier language of this same Epistle, “ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that being rich He became poor for your sakes, that ye through His poverty might become rich.” This grace is at once the fruit and the proof of the love of God, and finds its realization for the individual in the common life of the Spirit in the Church. Here again the Father is simply called God. The grace of the Son and the fellowship of the Spirit are not so much results as parts of the love of God.

3. We come next to the far less definite language of Romans xi. 36. It is unsafe to press the eloquence of adoration into the framework of theological analysis, or we might be tempted to follow Origen. Then the riches of God would be the Father, the source of power; the wisdom of God would be the Son, the source of reason; the knowledge



of God would be the Spirit, the source of conscious life. In 1 Corinthians ii. 11 the self-consciousness of the spirit of a man is regarded as analogous to the Spirit of God which knoweth the things of God. The Spirit might thus be recognized here in the *γνώσις* which is as it were the *σοφία* returning into the *πλοῦτος* of the mind of God in conscious self-recognition. But the distinction thus ventured is purely internal to the Godhead and therefore beyond our present scope. It is moreover precarious. Whether the *πλοῦτος* be taken separately from the *σοφία* and the *γνώσις* and interpreted of the goodness of God, or be taken in connexion with them as meaning the infinity of their resources, in either case St. Paul is concluding his treatment of the problem of the morality of God's predestination of man by insisting on the inability of man to fathom God's purpose, or to limit or exhaust God's love. It is the Godhead as a whole that is his immediate thought.

It is more material to our purpose to examine the words that follow : " For of Him and through Him and unto Him are all things." They have been explained again and again from Origen to St. Thomas Aquinas and onwards as an explicit reference to the three persons of the Holy Trinity, and this interpretation has found its latest and ablest defence in Liddon's analysis of this Epistle. It is *primâ facie* defensible, if the translation of *εἰς αὐτὸν* as *in ipso* be admitted. The Father is then the source of life, the Son the agent, the Spirit the instrument or the sphere. But the translation *in ipsum* or *ad ipsum* is beyond dispute, and the Holy Spirit can only by a forced exegesis be described as the goal of created life. We must therefore fall back upon the alternative view which regards the passage as describing " the relation of the Godhead as a whole to the universe and to all created things. God (not necessarily the Father) is the source and inspirer and goal of all things "

(Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, p. 340). It is, however, still justifiable to see in the three expressions, not indeed a distinct reference to each of the three Persons, but an enumeration of the three factors in the relation of God to the world which are revealed in the three Persons. A deeply suggestive analogy in Moberly's *Atonement and Personality* compares the Holy Trinity to the three stages of human action,—mind, purpose, achievement. In this sense the image of God embodied in the Son is reflected back to God from the world [by the Spirit working out the likeness of God in the world. The words *εἰς αὐτὸν* have then a reference to the Spirit. He is not Himself the *αὐτὸς* unto whom all things are,—God is the end of all life. But it is through the work of the Spirit that the world gives back to God (*εἰς αὐτὸν*) the reflection of the Father's purpose (*ἐξ αὐτοῦ*) revealed in the Son (*δι' αὐτοῦ*). We have here then distinct operations recognized as stages of the divine purpose though not assigned verbally to the different persons of the Holy Trinity.

4. We turn now to Ephesians iv. 4-6. "There is one body and one Spirit, even as also ye were called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism; one God and Father of all, who is over all, and through all and in all." The context deals with the need of diligence to preserve unity of feeling and action within the Church. To enforce the need and the possibility of this subjective unity the Apostle points to the objective unity of their spiritual life. The passage is parallel on one side to Ephesians ii. 18, "Through Him we both have our access in one Spirit to the Father"; and on the other side to I Corinthians iii. 22, 23, "All things are yours, and ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's." It is difficult to avoid recognizing here also the triad of hope, faith, and love on their divine side. The three Christian graces correspond to the facts of divine

action,—creation, redemption, sanctification. Love is the human response to the Fatherhood of God, faith to the work of the Saviour, hope to the indwelling of the Spirit. When we examine the text more closely, it is the simple language of the third clause which presents the only difficulty. Either the first person of the Holy Trinity is here called God, and His function is marked by the term Father indicating the source of all life ; or He is called God the Father, and His function is defined by the phrase which follows, He is over all and through all and in all. In the latter case it will be observed that this phrase works backward over the other two persons. God is transcendent, pervasive, immanent. Deism, Theism, Pantheism are in one sense isolations and therefore perversions of the truths embodied in the respective functions of Father, Son and Spirit.

The phrase itself involves two difficulties. (a) *Ἐπὶ πάντων* clearly expresses the sovereignty of God the Father ; *ἐν παῶσιν* suggests the indwelling of the Spirit of God. But *διὰ πάντων* has been variously interpreted, as denoting (1) the providence of the Father (Chrysostom) ; (2) the charismatic influence and presence of God by means of the Holy Spirit (Calvin and Meyer quoted by Ellicott) ; (3) the creative power of the Son (Thomas Aquinas, who inverts it into “*per quem omnia facta sunt*”). Probably the reference is to the work of the Son, whether it be His creative action or His reconciling influence, as Ellicott suggests. The three relations are therefore clear on the whole, though it is not clear whether they are to be assigned to the three Persons respectively or to the Godhead as a whole or to the Father as the one *πηγὴ ἐνεργείας*, working through the Son and the Spirit.

(b) There remains yet the question of the scope or range of action. In the case of the one Spirit and the one Lord it is obviously the Church, regarded first as a whole and then

in its members. But the reiterated *πάντων*, is it masculine or neuter? Is it the Church or humanity or creation? The Vulgate takes *διὰ πάντων* as neuter, Beza as masculine. Uniformity seems to require the masculine. The reference of the previous verses to the Church, the necessity of understanding *ἐν πάσῃ* of beings capable of the indwelling of a personal God, seem to limit *ἐπὶ πάντων* and *διὰ πάντων* also to humanity, if not to the Church. In any case there is no suggestion of a different sphere of action for each person of the Godhead. Their functions are distinguished in character but not in extent.

5. In the opening salutation of 1 Peter i. 2 the Christians of the dispersion are addressed as, "elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father through sanctification of the Spirit unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Christ." The leading thought is their election. It originates in the foreknowledge of the Father, it is effected through the sanctifying power of the Spirit, its end and aim is obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ. The difficulty here lies in the order and mutual relation of the work of the Spirit and of Christ. Assuming that the order is intended to mark stages in the progress of the Christian, we have then to decide whether it is the initial stage of Christian life which is here described or the subsequent development of that life. The clear allusion to the Mosaic covenant in the words "obedience and sprinkling" seems to refer the passage to that moment at which the obedience of man to God's call and the pardon of the man through the blood of Christ are sealed in his baptism. In that case the sanctification of the Spirit is either the consecration of the man's life by his baptism of water and the Holy Ghost or it is the preparatory influence of the Spirit in drawing him Christwards before his baptism. If, on the other hand, the sanctification of the Spirit be regarded as that progress in holiness which is the



sequel of union with Christ, then the obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Christ which are the end and aim of this progress must be something still ahead,—the perfect obedience unto death and the participation in the sufferings of Christ for which the Spirit trains and strengthens the Father's chosen servants. Here again all stages of the divine work alike,—the foreknowledge of the Father, the sanctifying influence of the Spirit, the application of the atonement of Christ or the realization of His sufferings, are common in their extent. They are regarded only in their relation to the elect. There is no hint of exclusion. Creation and humanity are simply not before us at this point. The Apostle is encouraging the elect with the thought that Father, Son and Spirit are all co-operating in their perfection.

6. With this last passage should be compared the thanksgiving of 2 Thessalonians ii. 13, 14,—“God chose you from the beginning unto salvation in sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth, whereunto He called you through our gospel to the obtaining of the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ.” Election originating in the love of God, worked out in life by the sanctifying presence of the Spirit,—so far the parallel with 1 Peter i. 2 is exact. The end of the life thus begun and continued is to be *εἰς περιποίησιν δόξης τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*. And the glory of Christ which is the reward of the Christian life is not merely the glory of which He is the possessor, it is the glory of which He is the giver. He is not only in Himself *ὁ κύριος τῆς δόξης* (1 Cor. ii. 8), He is for us the *ἀρχηγὸς τῆς ζωῆς* (Acts iii. 15; cp. v. 31), *τῆς σωτηρίας* (Heb. ii. 10), and *τελειωτῆς* as well as *ἀρχηγὸς τῆς πίστεως* (Heb. xii. 2). It is His work, not His position which is in question. But His work of redemption is here regarded not in the initial stage of atonement, as in St. Peter's salutation, but in the final stage of perfection. He is here *Christus consummator*.



7. There is another passage in which the work of each of the three divine Persons in the salvation of the individual is clearly marked, viz., Titus iii. 4-6. The entire work is attributed to the kindness and love of God our Saviour. Its realization for the individual is connected with the baptism which is the sign of the regenerating and renovating power of the Spirit. The Son is mentioned last here as in the two passages just considered. But here He is not the divine sufferer to whose death the Christian is to be made comformable, nor the conqueror whose glory the Christian is to share at last, but the mediator through whom the Father's gift of the Spirit is bestowed. But once more, though there is distinction of function, there is no distinction of object,—it is the elect who are alike the one object of the love that originates, the power that works, the grace that confers the salvation. And the unity of the whole of the divine operation is marked by the application of the term saviour both to God and to Jesus Christ. There is one salvation, the threefold work of the one God.

8. The last passage to be examined—Jude 20, 21—is not a prayer nor a doctrine, but an exhortation. “But ye, beloved, building up yourselves on your most holy faith, praying in the Holy Spirit, keep yourselves in the love of God, looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life.” This threefold application of the faith to life almost corresponds to the Pauline description of the Christian life as faith, hope and love. There is the faith which finds expression in prayer, the love which keeps the commandments of God and so keeps itself within the love of God, the hope which faces death and judgment as robbed of terror by the mercy of Christ. But conversely there is also a practical doctrine of the working of the Holy Trinity on and for man. There is the central, primal love of God ; there is the office of the

Spirit, prompting, guiding, sustaining, hallowing all devotion; there is the office of the Son to whom all judgment has been committed by the Father. Sanctification, justification,—the order is unusual but appropriate in this context, for it reminds the Christian that the life of prayer and obedience will yet need as it lies before the Judge the mercy of the Saviour whose earlier mercy made its beginning possible.

It would be a fairly true generalization from the passages here considered to say that the teaching of the New Testament contains the two ideas of distinctive functions within the Holy Trinity and of the unity of all action of the Holy Trinity, but that neither of the ideas is stated absolutely or defined precisely as a principle. The materials for a conclusion are all there, but the conclusion itself is not drawn. The doctrine is not given in the abstract; it is implied or rather applied in various practical forms. It is made the basis of instruction, of exhortation, of intercession. The functions assigned to the three divine Persons respectively are described in language that varies according as its context relates to the unity of Church life, to spiritual endowments for Christian service, to the sanctification of the individual, to human effort, or to divine grace, or to the relation of the Godhead to the world as a whole. To the Father are attributed love, foreknowledge, choice, sovereignty, all effective working; to the Son the grace of condescending, the atonement of suffering, mediation in the bestowal of the Spirit, the consummation of the glory of humanity, the mercy of final judgment; to the Spirit the regeneration and renewal of human nature, the fellowship of spiritual life in the body of Christ, the indwelling of the divine in the human, the growth in holiness. These attributes may fairly be grouped under the familiar headings of the doctrinal summaries of later ages,—creation, redemption, sanctification. But they are not regarded as

mutually exclusive. The language of some of the passages considered implies that the action of the Son and of the Spirit is embraced within the action of the Father. Other passages in the New Testament indicate that in each of the three stages of human destiny each of the three divine Persons has a share. Particular functions again imply different spheres of operation,—creation concerns the world, sanctification the Church. But nowhere is there a suggestion that the entire sphere of action of the Son or of the Spirit is less extensive than that of the Father. That doubtful and dangerous inference begins and ends with the peculiar teaching of Origen and his disciples, which lies beyond the scope of this article.

L. B. RADFORD.

#### NOTES ON RECENT NEW TESTAMENT STUDY.

IN the *North American Review* (June, 1906, pp. 861-874) Dr. C. A. Briggs discusses the relations of criticism and dogma with regard to the Virgin Birth. The accounts in Matthew and Luke are held to be derived from a common source, poetical in form, from which Luke has extracted more than Matthew, the editorial work of both being, however, "limited to translation and prose settings." The poems of which this primitive source consisted originated in the Palestinian community prior to 70 A.D., i.e. during the lifetime of James and Jude, the half-brothers of Jesus. They are therefore "credible to as high a degree as any other document in the New Testament." This nearness to Joseph and Mary guarantees the reliability of the tradition. The testimony of such witnesses, even to so unique a fact, must be admitted. Besides, "it is altogether improbable that any one in the first Christian century could have

thought of the Incarnation in any other way than by Virgin Birth. . . . It would be difficult to show that any one in the time of Jesus would have thought it possible that God could be born of a woman by the ordinary method of human generation. If any one really thought of the mode of Incarnation, the only mode thinkable in the first Christian century was Virgin Birth." Historical criticism, Dr. Briggs continues, cannot either verify the fact or dispute the doctrine. And the dogma has been vital in the Church from the beginning, nor does it lie within the province of physical science to do more than say that the Virgin Birth "is beyond the realm of Science, and that it is in the realm of Dogma ; and that the dogma must not be stated in any form that will contravene the laws of nature." Dr. Briggs then argues that the dogma is essential to the integrity of the Incarnation, i.e. "to the system of doctrine and the Faith of the Christian Church." As a dogma, the Virgin Birth must be retained at all costs ; the authority of the Church and the coherence of Christian doctrine alike demand its retention. "The Church can no more dispense with that doctrine than it can dispense with the Incarnation or with Christ Himself. It is not, however, essential to the faith or Christian life of individuals. The doctrine may for various reasons be so difficult to them that they cannot heartily accept it. They may content themselves with the doctrine of the Incarnation, and refuse to accept any doctrine as to its mode. They may even go so far as to deny the Virgin Birth, and hold to the theory of ordinary generation without accepting the legitimate consequences of that doctrine. Theologians are not always consequential. . . . The Church may, and in the present situation and circumstances of Christian theology, ought to, tolerate opinions which it cannot endorse."

On the other hand, Spitta comes forward afresh, in

Preuschen's *Zeitschrift* (1906, pp. 281 f.), to side with the large number of critics who believe that the allusion to the Virgin Birth in the first chapter of Luke, at any rate, is secondary. He brings forward the usual argument to show that, either in part or (as he himself believes) in whole, Luke i. 34-37 represents "an addition made by the editor of the gospel, based on stories of the birth of Jesus which, like that of Matthew i. 18-25, imply that Mary conceived by the Holy Spirit." Most scholars, who adopt this theory of interpolation or editorial expansion, are content to confine it to verses 34, 35 (so recently J. Weiss, in his *Schriften des NT.* ii. p. 387). But Spitta holds that verses 36, 37 must also go. "For the destiny sketched in verses 30, 33 for Mary, the allusion to Elizabeth becoming pregnant in her old age by Zacharias, would possess no meaning," whereas an announcement like that of verse 17 would have excited strong Messianic expectation in Mary's soul. "As such reflections, however, do not occur in 36, 37, and as these verses serve to explain verses 34, 35, we must regard the whole section, 34-37, as a later addition from the hand of the editor of the Gospel."

JAMES MOFFATT.



## *THE DIVISIONS OF THE FIRST EPISTLE OF ST. JOHN.*

*CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN DRS. WESTCOTT  
AND HORT.*

IN the Introduction to his Commentary on the First Epistle of St. John, Bishop Westcott says : “ It is extremely difficult to determine with certainty the structure of the Epistle. No single arrangement is able to take account of the complex development of thought which it offers, and of the many connexions which exist between its different parts.” This difficulty had been brought home to my father many years ere he wrote the above words, as the following private correspondence between him and his co-editor of the Greek Testament indicates. The correspondence is, unhappily, slightly deficient in the matter of Dr. Westcott’s contributions, but the substance of the matter which is lacking can be gathered from Dr. Hort’s replies. I found the papers in my father’s copy of his Commentary, and having read them with great interest obtained permission to place them before students of the New Testament, believing that many would welcome some small instalment of the mass of correspondence which passed between the co-editors of the Westcott and Hort Greek Testament. It will be remembered that the editors worked independently, and then compared results and argued out their differences. This little discussion not only illustrates their method of working,

but also the labour expended on parts of their work other than the text itself.

A. WESTCOTT.

Dr. Hort opens the correspondence by sending the following scheme of the divisions of the Epistle :

1 ST. JOHN.

Introduction. i. 1-4. The apostolic witness to the known truth bringing others into communion.

I. 5-II. 29. Good and Evil. Light and Darkness.

i. 5-ii. 6. God-likeness not indifference but sinlessness. Caps. at 1 and 3.

ii. 7-11. Exemplified in love contrasted with hatred.

ii. 12-17. The Father and the world.

ii. 18-29. The christs who abide and the antichrists who depart. Cap. at 26.

III.-IV. Sonship to God the foundation of knowledge and communion, and love answering the Father's love the foundation of righteousness.

iii. 1-10. Sonship incompatible with sin. Cap. at 7.

iii. 11-24. The tests of love. Caps. at 19 and 23.

iv. 1-6. The Spirits of Christ and of Antichrist. Cap. at 4.

iv. 7-21. The origin of love to God and man in God's own manifested love. Caps. at 13, 16, 17, and 19.

V. 1-17. Faith in the Son of God implies that sonship which makes love and obedience possible.

v. 1-3. Faith, love, obedience.

v. 4-12. The object of faith, and the witness on which it relies. Cap. at 6.

v. 13-17. The confidence and power of faith.

Conclusion. v. 18-21. The Christian knowledge centering in Him that is true. (Final warning against imaginary objects of worship.) Cap. at 21.

To the above scheme Dr. Hort appends the following remarks :

The lines of thought shoot across each other in such a complex manner in this marvellous Epistle that it is difficult to be sure one

has divided it rightly. Yet I think there cannot be much wrong here, though I may have failed to find the best and most comprehensive designations. The battle with a speculative and wrangling antinomianism, apparently attaching itself to the Baptist's name, and rejecting the Incarnation as antiquated (cf. *μένω* esp. in ii. 18-19 with *ὁ παράγων* in 2 John 9); professing "love" and denying "faith" underlies the argument, which yet, with all its recurring contrasts, is a positive one. Something might be said for space of one line between the present §§ and changing the ¶¶ to §§. But I do not think the §§ really too long, and the present arrangement brings out the connexions more clearly.

On this scheme of Dr. Hort's, Dr. Westcott scribbles a pencil note :

My division is so different that I think it best to send it. I spent a great deal of time upon it. The symmetry of the Epistle is marvellous.

Dr. Westcott's division of the Epistle will be found in Dr. Hort's next communication :

## COMPARATIVE TABLE OF DIVISIONS OF 1 JOHN.

<i>W.</i>		<i>H.</i> (first draft).	
<u>i. 1-4.</u> Prologue.		<u>i. 1-4.</u>	
<u>i. 5-ii. 17.</u> Introduction.		<u>i. 5-ii. 29</u>	
<i>A</i> <sup>1</sup>	<u>i. 5-ii. 2</u>	<i>A</i>	<u>i. 5-ii. 6</u>
<i>a</i>	i. 5	<i>a</i>	i. 5-10
	6, 7		
<i>b</i>	8, 9	<i>b</i>	
	10-ii. 2		ii. 1, 2
<i>c</i>	ii. 3-6	<i>c</i>	3-6
	ii. 3-5		
	6		
<i>B</i>	ii. 7-11	<i>B</i>	ii. 7-11
	ii. 7		
	8		
	etc.		
<i>C</i>	ii. 12-14	<i>C</i>	ii. 12-17
	ii. 15-17		

The lettering in the margins is the work of Dr. Westcott.

	W.
	<u>ii. 18-iv. 6</u>
A	ii. 18-25
a	ii. 18, 19
(b)	20-23
	24, 25
	<u>ii. 26-iii. 6</u>
c	ii. 26, 27
	28, 29
B a	iii. 1
	2, 3
b	4-6
	<u>iii. 7-12</u>
	iii. 7, 8
c	9, 10
	(11, 12
	iii. 11, 12
C	<u>iii. 13-24</u>
a (b)	iii. 13-17
(c)	18-20
	21-24

A	iv. 1-6
	iv. 1-3
	4-6

	<u>iv. 7-v. 12</u>
B a	iv. 7-10
(b)	iv. 11-16
c	iv. 17-21

C a	v. 1-5
b	v. 6-12
c	<u>v. 13-21.</u> <i>Epilogue.</i>

	H. (first draft).
A	ii. 18-29
a	ii. 18-25
b	
c	ii. 26-29
	<u>iii. iv.</u>
B (1-12)	iii. 1-10
a	iii. 1-6
b	
	7-10
c	
	iii. 11-24)
	iii. 11-24
C (13-24)	iii. 11-18
a b	
c	19-21
	22-24

A	iv. 1-6
	iv. 1-3
	4-6
B	iv. 7-21
a	iv. 7-12
b	13-15
	16
c	17, 18
	19-21

	<u>v. 1-17</u>
C a	v. 1-3
	v. 4-12
b	v. 4, 5
	6-12
c	v. 13-17
	<u>v. 18-21.</u> <i>Conclusion.</i>
	v. 18-20
	21

After a personal conference with Dr. Westcott, Dr. Hort sends a revised Scheme of Divisions, appending thereto remarks which, for convenience sake, I place first :

Your analysis and my first draft agree better than appears at first. Each has a short Prologue and Conclusion, and three principal masses of text between, and many smaller and not obvious subdivisions coincide. See the Comparative Table.

I gladly agree in making the first main division end at ii. 17. Originally I had 18-29 separately, which was not satisfactory. It is in a manner transitional ; but no doubt it goes best where you put it.

v. 1-17 always dissatisfied me by its shortness : but I do not think it is enough to go back to iv. 7 : therefore on the whole the true break seems to be at the beginning of the Chapter. Finally I think your " Epilogue " begins too soon, notwithstanding *ταῦτα ἔγραψα ὑμῖν*, which may as well mark the last member of the division as of the entire Epistle. Surely 18-21 exactly corresponds to the Prologue : it is the same thought as reached by an expounded process rather than as propounded by individual conviction. The § 13-17 seems to me far less comprehensive, and in its whole tone to belong to the body of the Epistle.

Your analysis has shown me much to which I was blind before ; but especially the probability of true symmetries. Nevertheless, I cannot follow the actual symmetries that you lay down, nor do I think a quinary type the most likely in itself. Surely it is more natural that the Prologue and Conclusion should stand apart, and the three great divisions themselves have a ternary structure. Such, I feel sure, is the case ; I think most of the subdivisions (including all those of the central division) again fall naturally into three groups of verses. I hope it is not presumptuous to ask you to look closely at the new draft which I now send. I think you will find a number of new correspondences (mostly at first unobserved by me) which afford strong confirmation.

The base of all, the first and the last, is the Christian knowledge, " That which we have seen and heard " (*οἶδαμεν*). This is the necessary condition of Faith (111), which is the necessary condition of Love (11), which is the necessary condition of Obedience (1). After the Prologue we begin with this last simplest region, and feel our way downwards, naturally taking with us the results already obtained. Obedience is associated with light and the Father ; Love with abiding and the Anointed Son ; Faith with truth and the Spirit.

The third ¶ of each division sets forth an antagonism of the world and God (ii. 12-17 ; iii. 13-24 ; v. 1-17, esp. 4, 5).



The first ¶ of each division starts from a heresy, the denial of sin (i. 5 ; ii. 6), the restlessness of the antichrists (ii. 18-29), the denial of the Son of God as come in the flesh (iv. 1-6).

The middle ¶ of each division sets forth some aspect of love, the old and new Commandment (ii. 7-11), the foundation of it in the gift (δέδωκεν iii. 1) of sonship (iii. 1-12), the origin of it in God's own manifested love (iv. 7-21).

I cannot think ἀγαπητοί, etc., a sure sign of a real break. It comes sometimes when a fresh subject is but just begun, as if the thought had fired the feeling, and necessitated a more direct and personal form of utterance (ii. 1, 28 ; iii. 2, 6, 18, 21 ; iv. 11).

ii. 3 is a return to the subject of "light" (knowledge) in another form after the partial digression on sin as sin (i. 8 ; ii. 2).

ii. 15 should have a cap. or not accordingly as 15 ff. is directly addressed to the whole Church or to νεανίσκοι only. I incline to think the latter, but am not sure. Though the world is not mentioned in 12-14, ὁ πονηρὸς must be intended as the antagonistic power within it.

I feel sure that ii. 26-29 belongs to 18-25 and not to iii. (cf. iv. 4-6 in relation to iv. 1-3). It repeats and expands the two partial Christian antitheses to the heresies : 20 f. to 18 f. and 24 f. to 22 f. In 27 μένετε is doubtless indicative, and in 28 imperative. This explains καὶ νῦν, τεκνία.

iii. 1-3 is confined to human sonship ; 4-8 to sin, its relation to the Son of God ; 9-12 to sonship as interpreted by His Sonship, 12 being an appended example of evil throwing out the good (cf. 16 f. after 13 ff. and 21 after 18 ff.).

Again, iii. 13-15 is confined to love in relation to the world's spirit ; 16-18 to its own reality within the Church ; 19-24 to peace and confidence with God. It is quite impossible to separate 20 and 21. Again, iv. 11 belongs closely to 10, and 12 to the whole passage 7-12 (esp. 7, 8) ; 13-16, on the other hand, belongs to another region, and says nothing, expressly, of love to men, either by man or by God (in 16 it is ἐν ἡμῖν).

## SECOND SCHEME OF DIVISIONS.

### i. 1-4. Introduction.

i. 5-ii. 17.<sup>1</sup> God and the true light : goodness, not indifference.

i. 5-ii. 6. Godlikeness in man freedom from evil.

i. 5-7. *Walking* in the light, ἀμαρτ.

8-ii. 2. Sin foregone or forgiven ὁ λογ. αὐτ. and γινώσκ

Cap. ii. 1.

<sup>1</sup> Footnote—This and following numbers refer to Dr. Westcott's notes given below.

- ii. 3-6. Godlikeness, keeping God's commandments,  
*ἐντολαί.*
- ii. 7-11. The new light, the old. ? Cap. 9.
- ii. 12-17. The Father and the world eternally at war, *μένει.*  
??? Cap. 15.
- ii. 18-iii. 24.<sup>2</sup> Sonship to God, and hence likeness to His Son, and  
of *abiding* in Him.
- ii. 18-29. The christs who abide and the antichrists who  
depart.
- ii. 18-21. Antichrists and christs, *ψεῦδος.* Cap. 20.
- 22-25. Denial and keeping of the truth. Cap. 24.
- 26-29. They in whom the anointing abides, themselves  
abide and have confidence: *γεγενν. τέκνα.* Cap. 28.
- iii. 1-12. Sonship the root of sinlessness. Cap. 2.
- iii. 1-3. Likeness to God and sonship to God.
- <sup>3</sup>4-8. Sin that which the Son of God abolishes (Son  
opp. to Devil). Cap. 7.
- 9-12. Sonship manifested by righteousness and love.  
(? Cap. 11, or perhaps better 12.)
- Hatred=death.
- iii. 13-24. Hatred from the world and acceptance with God.
- iii. 13-15. The world's hatred the sign of entrance into  
life.
- <sup>4</sup>16-18. Love known in the sacrifice of life, which  
proves its truth, *ἀλήθεια.* Cap. 18.
- 19-24. Peace with God through (1) obedience to  
Him, (2) faith in His Son's Name, (3) love to your  
brethren: attested by the presence of the Spirit.  
*πνεῦμα* (also 23).
- <sup>5</sup>iv. 1-v. 17. Faith resting on knowledge of the truth the mark of  
the Divine Spirit, not indifference.
- iv. 1-6. The spirits of the truth and of error.
- perhaps } iv. 1-3. The test of spirits in doctrine.  
only cap. } 4-6. The test of spirits in response and  
victory.
- iv. 7-21. Love the mark of those who know themselves to be  
God's children.
- <sup>6</sup>iv. 7-12. Love the duty of those whom God has  
loved *ἐν ᾧ. μένει.* Cap. 11.
- 13-16. That love of His known only through the  
faith, and itself the ground of abiding in God.  
? Caps. 14, 16.

- 17-21. Love perfected in fearlessness towards God  
and love of the brother (*ἀγ. κ. τ. ἀδ.*). Cap. 19.
- v. 1-17. Faith in the manifested Son the condition of love  
and obedience.
- v. 1-5. Faith, love, obedience.
- 6-12. Faith's power derived from its object, and the  
witness of God (*ῥῶν*).
- 13-17. Faith the source of life and the power of  
prayer. Cap. 16.
- v. 18-21. Conclusion. The Christian knowledge : the true and  
the false. Cap. 21

On Dr. Hort's Revised Scheme of Divisions Dr. Westcott makes the following notes :

1. i. 6-ii. 2. Here I think that the triple division is most important.

6-7 walking in darkness and opposite.

8-9 assertion of irresponsibility and opposite.

10-ii. 2. denial of actual sin and opposite.

2. ii. 18-iii. 24. This division I can accept. iv. 1-6 is a mediating paragraph.

The subordinate divisions also I can accept. As to ii. 26-29, I am not quite clear ; nor as to the division of 18-25. But if 26-29 goes with the latter, then the division which you give is best. In fact, the thoughts are so manifold that many divisions hold truly.

3. I do not think that 7-8 can be joined with 4-6. They prepare 9-12.

4. I very much prefer to keep 18 with 19ff. It sounds like the extension of 16-17 to a new region.

5. iv. 1-v. 12.

6. Again I prefer to join iv. 11-12 with 13ff., which really explains the scope of Christian love (16).

7. v. 13-End.

I still cling to the old Epilogue. Really this 13-21 corresponds to i. 1-4, as the fulfilment of life (i. 2 ; v. 13) and joy even beyond sin. That the Epilogue begins with v. 13 seems indicated also by John xx. 30, 31. The speciality of 16 springs, I imagine, from the obvious disturbance of sin in the Church, which leads on to 18, and I do not see how you can begin abruptly with 18.

In conclusion Dr. Westcott says :

Our points of difference lie now in the transition members : iii. 7, 8 ; iii. 18 ; iv. 11, 12 ; v. 13-17. I do not think that you give sufficient weight to St. John's mode of half-repeating what he has

said with the purpose of extending its application. In this respect the repetition of the theme makes always a *new* division.

However, our differences now are really small.

On receipt of Dr Westcott's Notes Dr Hort forwarded a second revision of the Scheme of Divisions for the Epistle. He writes :

I am very glad to find we do not now substantially differ. I presume you accept the ternary structure. You have not marked caps. Do you assent to those set down ? (They are now modified, and all more or less doubtful.)

The principle which you mention I entirely recognize : indeed I had imagined myself to have been in great measure guided by it. But surely it is equally certain that St. John winds up many divisions with a reference to their beginnings : indeed, this follows almost as a matter of course when there is tripleness and at the same time not mere co-ordination but progression. If so, care must be needed to distinguish the two possibilities in any given case. And it seems to me that the repetition which opens new divisions is not so much of statements as of ideas or words : ("transitional words" I think you called them in marking some : I marked a few more).

I hope you do not mind looking once more at the disputed verses, except the Epilogue. Discussion of these matters seems to me to waste time less than almost anything that we do. I have examined all points carefully with a strong desire to be convinced.

i. 5-ii. 6.

You do not say what you do with 5<sup>1</sup>. Both it and ii. 3-6 disturb your triple division. But I cannot recognize your three distinct pairs. 6, 7, 8, 9 might do well enough. But the second member is wanting to 10 ; i.e., it comes only in unsymmetrical form in 1*b*, and that after the interruption of 1*a*. It does seem to me better to treat 10-12 as an extension of 8, 9. "Actual sin" does not begin with 10 ; 9 has the plural τὰς ἁμαρτίας. 1*a*, in fact, includes both aspects (sinfulness and sins), and so virtually do 1*b*, 2. In fact, 9 may be as well coupled with 10 as with 8 : i. 10 is a return to 8 suggested by 9, only in the region of past fact. All three verses treat of the false abolition of sin (by denial), as 1 and 2 treat of its true abolition (by forgiveness) : 3*a* is thus, in your sense, a presumptive introduction to 1*b* and 2. Of 5-7 light and darkness are the key-words, of 8-ii. 2 sin, of 3-6 τῇρῳ + μένω (both containing permanence). This last is resumed in οὐκ . . . καὶ νῦν.

ii. 18, 19, 20-22, give the historical present antichrists, and those who are their opposites. ii. 22-25 run aside first to lay down the permanent principle of an antichrist, and then to exhort the opposite, with a natural expression of the ζῶή of i. 1, 2 ; v. 13, 20 ; ii. 26

returns to the actual present, and the following *vv.* dwell on the *χρῖσμα* of truth (cf. v. 20), and the abiding, in contrast to the first member 18-21 (where cf. *προάγων*, 2 John 9).

It is possible to take 28 f. with what follows, letting *μένετε ἐν αὐτῷ* be resumptive. But it is better to take *τέκνα θεοῦ* in iii. 1 as resumptive of . . . (*caetera desunt*).

I am content now to let the third main division end at v. 12 instead of 17. 12 has the sound of a true ending more than 17, and there are other reasons. (But see below.)

iv. 11f. Again *ἀγαπητοί*. In 13 *ἐν αὐ. μέν. κ. αὐτος ἐν ἡμῶν* is resumptive of *ἐν ἡμῶν μένει* in 12, but at the same time digressive, leaving altogether the subject of love, and going off to "spirits" which had been spoken of in 1-6. There is no break of matter in 7-12. On the other hand I believe I was quite wrong in making the third member begin at 17<sup>5</sup>. It should begin at 16, which distinctly proceeds after the interruption of 13-15. Thus the third member 16-21 itself falls easily into three parts (which may be marked by capitals) at 17 and 19, 17f. being digressive.

None of the breaks in v. 1-12 are satisfactory<sup>6</sup>. I now much incline to propose to take the Epilogue into the last division<sup>7</sup> (v. 1-12; 13-17; 18-21); the relation of 18ff. to 11, 12 is very like that of a third to a first member.

Another reason for this is the unsatisfactoriness of leaving ii. 7-11, 12-17, not divided in threes; to which add the awkwardness of making a great break (space of one line) precede a *καὶ* (i. 5). May we not include the Prologue thus (i. 1-4; 5-ii. 6; 7-17)? i. 1-4 may be left undivided; ii. 7-17 may fall into 7, 8; 9-11; 12-17; this brings the *γράφω* of 12ff. into a close relation with that of 7ff., and 9-11 is very like a middle member.

There remains undivided in three only iv. 1-6; and there I should be disposed now to make a break at 2 as well as at 4. This would be substantially analogous to ii. 18-21; 22-25; 26-29.

I will now set down what finally seems to me the best arrangement:

### THIRD SCHEME OF DIVISIONS.

CAPS.			
I. i. 1-ii. 17		II. ii. 18-iii. 24	CAPS.
i. 1-4		ii. 18-29	
i. 5-ii. 6		ii. 18-21	20 ?
i. 5-7		ii. 22-25	24 ?
i. 8-ii. 2	(ii. 1 ??)	ii. 26-29	(28 ??)
ii. 3-6		iii. 1-12	
ii. 7-17		iii. 1-3	(2 ??)
ii. 7, 8 <sup>2</sup>		iii. 4-8	(7 ??)
ii. 9-11		iii. 9-12	12 ? No. W.
ii. 12-17	(15 ???)		



iii. 13-24	CAPS.	iv. 7-21	CAPS.
iii. 13-15		7-12	(11 ??)
iii. 16-16	(18 ??)	iv. 13-15	(14 ???)
iii. 19-24	21 ? <sup>3</sup>	iv. 16-21	17 ?, 19 ?
III. <u>iv. 1-v. 21</u>		v. 1-21	
iv. 1-6		v. 1-12	
iv. 1		v. 13-17	16 ?
iv. 2, 3		v. 18-21	21 ?
iv. 4-6			

On Dr. Hort's third Scheme of Divisions Dr. Westcott makes a few pencil notes, for the most part accepting the proposed capitals. At the foot of the page he writes : " For the rest, after a final pleading, I throw myself on your mercy or discretion." This " final pleading " is set forth in the remarks made by him on this revised scheme and the explanatory notes thereto attached, to which Dr. Hort again replied. These remarks and replies run as follows :

1. W. writes : I should place i. 5 by itself, i.e. give ¶ cap. to Εὰν in 6 ; and so ii. 3-6. i. 5 is the subject ; i. 6-ii. 2 the working out ; ii. 3-6 the conclusion. The variation in the form of the third division is due to the substance of it. We have sinned and sin (sin and have sinned, H.), and yet it was to prevent sin that St. John wrote. However, sin is no longer fatal.

H. replies : I can accept making 5 a separate subsection, though I should have preferred cap. only at 6 and ¶ at 8, so as to keep the light and darkness together : in my view 5 is said for the sake of its application, so that 6 ff. is part of the primary position. What I like less is cap. at 10, especially with none at ii. 1 (the only ΤΕΚΝ. or ἀγ.—unless it be iii. 21—without cap.). Most of our subdivisions or subsections have been binary : and so here I should prefer ¶¶ 8, ii. 3 ; caps. 6, ii. 1 : but if you feel strongly about taking 6 ff. with what follows, will you not drop the cap. at 10 (if you dislike it at ii. 1) ?

W. replies : I now give cap. at ii. 1 (where I was faithless to my own view before) : but I wish ¶ at 10, or not at 8 : i.e., the divisions at 8 and 10 seem to me homologous. Perhaps a compromise would be ¶ at end of 5 : caps. at 6, 8, 10, ¶ at ii. 3. This keeps the binary arrangement. Decide as you like in the spirit of this.

2. W. writes : I prefer still ¶¶ 7-11, 12-17, caps. at 9, 15. H. replies : Your proposal would make this the only section divided into two members. Surely we should keep the triple form if we reasonably can : as I think we may by dividing at 9. Does not 7 ff.

answer to i. 5-7 (or 5 if you like)? Love of the brethren surely (in spite of iii. 11, John xiii. 34) is a part, not the whole, of the ἐντολή.

W. replies: A division at 9 will answer to a division at i. 5, and I can accept it.

Further, H. writes: Do you decidedly think that ii. 15-17 is not part of the special message to νεανίσκοι begun in 14?

W. replies: Doubtless suggested by νεανίσκοι, but not confined to them. Cap. better perhaps on the whole.

3. H. writes: We seem to be giving Ἀγαπητοί cap. always, so I suppose also at iii. 21.

W. replies: It is better I see to give caps. in all places.

4. W. writes: ??

H. replies: This may doubtless be questioned: but look at iii. 24 (contr. iv. 1), iv. 6, v. 6.

5. W. writes: I am not satisfied here. I decidedly prefer still to begin with 17: 17 resumes 12*b* verbally; but there may be caps. at 18, 19.

H. replies: 15 resumes 12*a* in like manner. Surely not a cap. at 18, which is exexegetical of παρησία in 17, and in its close repeats the language of 17*a*. The ends of 15 and 16 correspond no doubt, but precisely because they give the correspondence of two different spheres: 13 and 15 relate to Spirit and Truth, knowledge and faith, confession and testimony, all founded in the revealed Son. 16, like 17-21, relates to Love, which is shown to be no less dependent upon God. It lays down broadly that our love is God's love in us: then 17*f*. expounds this idea on its Divine side, as implying a continuity of being which tends to expel fear: while 19 ff. expounds it on its human side and its analogous application in practice.

W. replies: I give up cap. at 18. The other line is very hard to draw. On reading again I am inclined to take 16*a* with 15, 16*b* as a new subject with 17 ff. Then ἐγνωκάμεν κ. πεπιστεύκαμεν sum up and lead on.

6. W. writes: v. 1-12 falls very fairly into three: 1, 2; 3-5; 6-12. (Love—victory—witness.)

H. replies: 3 seems to me absolutely inseparable from 1, 2; 4*f*. arise from βαρ. οὐκ εἰς. I should not greatly object to caps. at 4 and 6, though I would rather not have them: but ¶ seems to me to dislocate the section.

W. replies: This I cannot see. The identification of love and obedience is new. Caps. will satisfy me.

7. W. writes: I very much prefer to keep the Epilogue distinct. For the rest there are no serious differences. On the points which I have noticed I feel strongly after considering your arguments, and trust that you may on the whole agree with me or not disagree.

H. replies: To think that I should have to plead with you against

a wanton violation of symmetry ! I really see no more reason for disjoining the Epilogue than the Prologue ; and the cohesion is illustrated by my inclination to take 13-17 with what precedes. Do let St. John keep his triads, if you can. Also consider how very short you would make the last division.

W. replies : Very well. Let us see the effect in print.

The Westcott and Hort Greek Testament was published in May, 1881, and a second edition with a considerable number of corrections was issued in December of the same year. In that interval the divisions of the First Epistle of St. John were again considered, for in October, Dr. Hort, apparently in reply to a suggestion from Dr. Westcott that iv. 1-6 should be transferred from the third to the second main division,<sup>1</sup> wrote :

Would you mind glancing over the old papers on the divisions of 1 St. John ? See especially what is marked with red.<sup>2</sup> It seems to me that the second and third divisions (ii. 18 ff. ; iv. 1 ff.) both begin with errors or authors of error ; and that the first division (after the Prologue) implicitly does the same (i. 5-8), while another similar implication closes the Epistle (v. 21). The antichrists seem to belong to the second division (the Son), as the false prophets (or their spirits) do to the third (the Spirit). It is remarkable that with the solitary exception of the close of iii., striking the keynote for what follows, *πνεῦμα* is confined to iv. and v.

As far as I can see the symmetry of the Epistle cannot be restored if iv. 1-6 is thrown back.

### PANTHEISM.

ANY adequate account of Pantheism, and any sufficient criticism of it would take many volumes, and would need for their fulfilment a knowledge of the history of human thought since man began seriously to think. For there has always been a tendency towards the pantheistic solu-

<sup>1</sup> In Bishop Westcott's own Commentary on 1 St. John, iv. 1-6 is placed in the second main division.

<sup>2</sup> The passage marked with red is that on p. 485 f. : "The base of all . . . God's own manifested love, iv. 7-21."

tion of the problem of knowledge and life. The desire after unity in life and thought, the recoil against dualism or pluralism, have ever led towards Pantheism. The pantheistic solution is so obvious, so ready to hand, that one is not surprised that it should have been early reached and that it should be with us at the present hour. From the time of Lao-tze onwards the thought of the unity which is at once the path and the pathgoer, the eternal road and those who walk on it, has been the common property of systems in the Eastern and the Western worlds, in ancient and in modern times. Yet with the thought of an all-comprehensive unity, there has been a difference of view as to the factor which really constitutes the unity. Taking the word itself as the first clue to its meaning, we may point out that as we lay stress on the *παν* or the *θεός* it may mean either (1) that the All is God, or else (2) that God is all, that the only existence real and active is God. That is, it may signify (1) that the sum-total of particular existences is God, that the universe is itself the only real being: or (2) it may mean that God, the Absolute Being, is the only real being, that all finite being is only appearance, and is only illusion. Pantheism may thus be equivalent to a denial of God, or it may mean a denial of the reality of the world. It may be atheism or akosmism. In any event it means an absolute identification of God and other being. It either merges God in the universe, or the universe is merged in God.

As a matter of fact Pantheism has manifested itself in the history of thought in these two forms. The first form which naturally arises is that which identifies the world with God and merges Him in the world. For in the childhood of man and of the race man lives an external life. Men are merged in the objective world. They do not seem to be conscious of themselves, reflection has not even

begun. Savages seem to live almost entirely outside of themselves; objects, as they stand outside, seem to move them; their passions are like natural forces; they do not seem to feel as if they were distinct from their passions, and able to control them in any way or to any end. The savage thinks of himself simply as an object among other objects, and all existence is for him a localized existence in space and time. Man at first looks outward and not inward, and this outwardness rules all his thinking and all his living. It is quite natural also at this stage of his development that he should think of all objects and all men as having feelings, thoughts, and passions like his own. For it is quite within the power of the unreflective consciousness to be conscious of its own reactive activity, of its feelings, passions, desires in relation to things and persons in the external world. This rough and ready consciousness is transferred to all objects, and thus we have the animistic state of mind. It is not necessary to describe Animism at any length, or to enter into the controversy as to its nature and character, or to ask whether it is really primitive, as Tylor affirms, or derivative, as Spencer contends. Sufficient for our purpose is the acknowledged fact, that it is at all events relatively primitive and widely prevalent. Early man, then, regarded his own experience as universal, and looked at all things as like himself. Stones, trees, rivers, mountains, stars, all things which were present to his senses, were taken in their simplicity, as they appeared, and their reality was never questioned. They were there in their concrete reality, they could be touched or seen, and they had their position outside of himself, and remained whether he was present or not.

To him also these appeared to have a life of their own, and just as he reacted against outward things, so they reacted against him. Out of this animistic belief arose,



as reflection increased, the further belief that the objects with which he came into contact had their feelings in relation to him, as he had feelings in relation to them. They were hostile or friendly, or they might be made so, and out of this feeling arose certain rules and rites which would make hostile objects friendly, and place their assistance on his side. Thus beliefs hardened into customs, and customs in their turn gave rise to further explanations, and mythology came into being. But at the base of it all seems to lie the fundamental belief that all things had a life of their own, and that their attitude to the individual depended on his behaviour.

Some of these beings seemed to the primitive man to be capricious and changeable ; and he could never say what their attitude to him might be. Some, again, were the same yesterday, to-day, and to-morrow. And some were now stable and firm in their attitude, and others were full of change. Hills, mountains, and stars were fixed, and continued to maintain their immoveable attitude, while the regular return of night and day, of summer and winter, of seedtime and harvest, gave him the consciousness of permanence. Slowly the thought of order would arise in his mind, and the belief that things might be permanent might find a place among his beliefs. But so long as he believed in the view that each thing had a life and action proper to itself, he would find it difficult to reach the conception of order in the world outside himself. Certain aspects of the world tended towards such a belief, but certain other aspects tended the other way. For there were many objects around him, and each had its own way. He had to adjust his conduct to the separate ways of each.

Many of these objects were greater, stronger, more powerful than himself, and his attitude towards them was one of awe and fear. They might help him, or they might injure

him, and it was needful that he should gain their help or avert their hostility. It is not necessary to trace the process by which their primitive beliefs grew till they became the complicated systems which we read of in the religions of the world. What we are concerned with here is to note how primitive Animism grew into Polytheism, and how, with the necessity under which the human spirit ever lies of reaching some form of unity, Polytheism developed into Pantheism. Pantheism is the form which Polytheism takes as it strives to find a unity for itself. It may be safely said that the unity which appears in the religions of the world, in all the religions we know, is a pantheistic unity. It is so in the religion of Egypt, it is so in China and in India, it is so in Greece and in Rome. In fact, there have been only three monotheistic religions in the history of man, and these are closely connected with one another : the religion of the Hebrews, the religion of Christianity, and the religion of Mohammed.

All objects in the world were to the early man living things with a life and action of their own. What the particular form of that life was, was determined for early man by its particular action. Each thing had its own characteristics, and each had to be dealt with separately. And the particular strength, power, and action of the thing indicated the amount of respect to be paid to it. Into this attitude was gathered the full stream of the growing experiences of the generations, and each experience helped to raise to a higher level the estimate in which particular powers of nature were held. The respect and reverence which early men paid to the powers of nature were blended with the respect which they felt for the men among themselves who had manifested special power, had unusual gifts of strength, cunning or power. Ancestor worship blended with the reverence for natural objects, and all

experience flowed together to enhance the practice of Polytheism.

But here came the parting of the ways, which led, on the one hand, to the materialistic Monism of the present time, and, on the other hand, to the objective idealism which obtains so widely to-day. These have their roots deep down in the primitive Animism, which took the experience, unreflective experience no doubt, but still a real experience, as the type of the experience of the universe. But there are two elements in experience. There is the objective element and the subjective. There is the world of objects and there is the inner life to which they appear. Both elements are together, and they can never be separated, except in abstraction. But they have been separated, and one or other of them has thrust the other into the background. In the one result you have a material world, with its appearance in time and space, with its own laws of causality, and its own ongoing, and the world of mind is simply an unexplained accompaniment, only with that significance which the ticking of the clock has to its action. Thus there may be a materialistic Pantheism, a Pantheism which is the negation of spirit, a Monism which makes mind secondary, derivative, simply an element in experience which is without significance.

But this mode of explanation appeared early in the history of human thought. How it arose is easily understood. Early man, living in a world of objects, dealing with them in daily intercourse, apprehended them in their apparent objectivity, and was oppressed by their constant presence. He looked out at them, and never looked within. Each object, too, had its own peculiar nature, but they had this in common, that they were all outside, and all were always there. There was a certain permanence attaching to them all, and all of them could be seen,

some of them could be touched: may there not be some quality which they all had in common? They had this at least, that they were all of them in a world external to the individual, and appeared to be independent of him. The first questions asked by man, when he began to ask questions at all, was as to the whence and the how of the actual world around him. Whence was it and what has been its becoming? Answers to these questions arose, and are recorded in the systems of the world. In some cases the questioner neglected the inner factor, and laid stress on what seemed external. The material world was everywhere present, and seemed to go a way of its own.

Thus we find systems which explained the whence and the how of things from the ongoing of the world of nature. It was first, and man was only a product of it. Early in the history we find this naturalism, and in the systems of Leucippus, Democritus, and Epicurus it lies before us in full development. Its mystic and poetic side appears in the wondrous poem of Lucretius. And more recently it appears in the modern systems of materialist unity, from the *Système de la nature*, to the Monism of Haeckel. The watchwords of this type of monistic thought are of this kind, "everything happens by natural means," "nature is all-sufficient," "there can be no intervening influence from without or beyond nature." "There is no purpose, events happen, they are never meant." One would expect that a naturalism of this kind would have felt bound to think out what it meant by Nature. But it is an attitude of mind which has not anything to do with concrete and exact knowledge of nature. It has quite a number of ideas which are not in any true sense scientific. Though opposed instinctively to any conception of interference from without nature, yet nature itself may, and often does,



take on a mystic shape, and teams with mysterious agencies. Nature may become the Alma Mater, and the attitude towards nature may be that of reverence and worship. The outcome is not a denial of the divine, but an ascription of divinity to nature itself. It is not Atheism, it is Pantheism. Everything happens naturally, but nature itself is instinct with divine life. It is the all-living which, without haste and without rest, pours forth its inexhaustible fulness into the finite forms of being. Nature itself is cause, principle, and unity ; she is the fruitful mother of all things ; she is the *natura naturans*, and the *natura naturata*. If it retains the name of God, it means only the Logos of Heracleitus and the Stoics, the *Anima Mundi*, the meaning and reason of all-living nature. It delights to dwell on the Immanence of God, and is concerned to deny a God who is something for Himself. Its God must dwell only in the world, and is never to be thought of as having any meaning purpose or action save within the universe.

Along this tendency of thought, which appears from age to age, there is another tendency equally conspicuous and equally constant. It does not dwell on the external world, its order, its causality, and its steadfastness. It is occupied with the world within. The spirit of man has somehow become aware of itself, conscious of its own activity, of its own meaning as a factor in its own experience. It feels that it is something, it can stand over against the world, and distinguish itself from the world. May not the self be the only permanent thing among the constant becoming, and changing flux of things ? The self remains, conscious somehow of its own unity and persistency : may not the external world be only a seeming world, and the self the only—the final—reality ? The most complete expression of this tendency is found in the Upanishads, set forth thus by Dr. Deussen, who is in entire sympathy with the



philosophy of the Upanishads. He speaks of the great "Intellectual truth that this entire universe, with its relations in space, its consequent manifoldness, and dependence upon the mind that apprehends, rests solely upon an illusion ('Mâyâ') natural to us owing to the limitations of our intellect; and that there is in truth one Being alone, eternal, exalted above space and time, multiplicity and change, self-revealing in all the forms of nature, and by me, who myself also am one and undivided, discovered and realized within as my very Self, as the Âtman." (*The Upanishads*, Deussen, English Translation, pp. 48-9.) It may be well to quote another paragraph: "There have been three occasions, as far as we know, on which philosophy has advanced to a clearer comprehension of its recurring task and of the solution demanded; first in India in the Upanishads, again in Greece in the philosophy of Parmenides and Plato, and finally, at a more recent time, in the philosophy of Kant and Schopenhauer. In a later word we shall have to show how Greek philosophy reached its climax in the teaching of Parmenides and Plato, that this entire universe of change is, as Parmenides describes it, merely phenomenal, or, in Plato's words, a world of shadows, and how philosophers endeavoured through it to grasp the essential reality, τὸ ὄν, τὸ ὄντως, ὄν, that which Plato, in an expression that recalls the doctrine of the Upanishads no less than the phraseology of Kant, describes as the αὐτό (âtman) καθ' αὐτό (an sich). We shall see how this same thought, obscured for a time under the influence of Aristotle and throughout the Middle Ages, was taken up again in quite a different way, and shone forth more clearly than ever in the philosophy of Kant, adopted and perfected by his great successor, Schopenhauer. Here we have to do with the Upanishads, and the world-wide significance of these documents cannot,

in our judgment, be more clearly indicated than by showing how the deep fundamental conception of Plato and Kant was precisely that which formed the basis of Upanishad teaching." (*Op. cit.* pp 41-2.)

It is not our purpose to trace the history of the striving after unity or the search after some fundamental conception which might express the reality of the universe, while it would also set forth the reality of every particular being. Briefly the fundamental conception was expressed either in terms of the objective world or in terms of the perceiving and thinking mind. In both cases there were fringes attached to the main conception by means of which they sought to conserve what the main conception almost in terms denied. Naturalism, in opposition to its own principles, spoke in poetic and in religious tones of the spirit of Nature, of the mystic glow which in times of emotion it saw shining over the world, or issuing forth from it, while on the other hand the advocates of the supremacy of the universal self allowed some show of reality to the finite experience of finite selves. To trace these tendencies in Greek philosophy, in Oriental speculation, or in the scholasticism of the Middle Ages, would far exceed our limits. Nor is it necessary to do so, for they reappear in our modern philosophy enriched by the experience of mankind, and specially by the mastery of the world attained by modern science. That form of Pantheism which Greek materialism elaborated appears to-day in the evolutionary Pantheism of Spencer and Haeckel, while the Pantheism of the Upanishads appears in absolute idealism, which regards the universe as the experience of a single life, or the expression of an Absolute Self-consciousness. While the modern forms gather up in themselves the historic gains of former explorations, they owe their precise shape mainly to the influence of Kant. All modern problems of philosophy date from him.

To him may be traced the current forms of Agnosticism and also the apotheosis of the single absolute experience, and of absolute self-consciousness. No doubt the advocates of both delight to read the history of philosophy and gather from it illustrations and adumbrations of their own solution, but it is still true that they follow in the footsteps of Kant, and deal with their problem under conditions set by him. To the man of science, who regards all inquiries into ultimate reality as vain, and who steadily opposes a "We do not know" to all questions beyond phenomena and their interconnexions, Kant is the great exemplar, for did he not limit inquiry to the realm of possible experience? Besides, Kant was himself a man of science, who had mastered the science of his time and had indeed extended its boundaries. He accepted the order of nature, and also the phenomena of duty, and had asked the question of their possibility and validity. This had led him into an inquiry as to the nature and validity of human knowledge. Not to dwell on his view of perceptions and conceptions, or on the synthetic unity of Apperception and its significance, it is sufficient to say here that his restriction of knowledge to phenomena, and his recognition of things in themselves as lying beyond knowledge, laid the foundation on which the structure of Agnosticism has been built up.

He was successful in his attempt to vindicate the possibility of experience, and the possibility of science. That is, he succeeded in showing that experience is a connected whole, that the categories were immanently at work in all experience. The fact of succession was possible because the notion of permanence and change, the notion of causality, are involved in the apprehension of succession, and without these connecting links succession could not be apprehended. But while these categories are there and are at

work, they have their sphere of operation and their validity only in relation to the experience they set in order. The orderly arrangement of experience suggests a perfect system. It is possible to define the ideas and ideals through which such a perfect system might be realized. As, however, these are not indispensable to experience Kant denies reality to them. It can only remain an ideal which regulates only that part of it which may fall within the range of my experience, or, in moral experience, it may become an absolute postulate and an object of faith. Kant's philosophy is altogether a critical philosophy, a study of the terms and relations of human knowledge. Beyond this realm these terms and relations have no validity. There remained in his philosophy the abstract opposition between the subject in itself and the object in itself. The object remained inaccessible to the subject, or there were aspects of the object which refused to submit to the categories, and these were outside the bounds of human knowledge. The result thus attained was accepted by many. It fell in with the tendency to circumscribe human knowledge, and to limit it to the phenomenal world, or the world suggested to us by sense-experience. Comte, perhaps not directly influenced by Kant, but breathing the same atmosphere, limited knowledge to the immediate and autocratic evidence of sensible experience. In effect he said, Let all theological and metaphysical entities be banished for evermore, for they are all like the product of illusion, abstraction, and conjecture. Organize life without reference to any ultimate reality. In a consistent way he wrought his system, though in the end he brought back an abstraction, called it Humanity, and enthroned it in the vacant place. In the interest, too, of theistic faith Agnosticism was cultivated, and in the hands of Sir William Hamilton and Dean Mansel gave rise to the philosophy of the Unconditioned. We do not dwell on



this save to say that the argumentation of Hamilton and Mansel supplied Spencer with the basis of his doctrine of the Unknowable. To do Spencer justice he endeavoured to avoid the negative conclusions of Hamilton and Mansel, and allowed a vague consciousness of an Ultimate reality, but of such a sort as remained beyond the bounds of positive knowledge. Spencer appeared at an appropriate time. Science had greatly advanced, evolution was in the air, and to Spencer appeared the vision of cosmic evolution. An immanent movement, not the Dialectic movement of Hegel, but a movement within the field of reality, was the means by which evolution was to be accomplished. The great thought dawned on his mind, and he set himself to work it out. Speedily he was strengthened in an unexpected manner by the appearance of Darwin's work. Spencer endeavoured to work out his thesis, and sought to set forth a system of philosophy in which the interests reflected in the Agnosticism of Hamilton and Mansel, the Positivism of Comte, the generalizations of science, and even the interests of religion might be reconciled in the higher synthesis of the synthetic philosophy. It must be admitted that the Unknowable appeared to be far from home in his positive synthetic procedure. As soon as he obtains his postulate, the persistence of force, the Unknowable ceased to be an active partner in the business, it served only to provide a safe receptacle for the shelving of unanswerable questions. In the end his philosophy ceases to be agnostic and becomes a Pantheism largely dominated by material interests. To prove this thesis it is only necessary to quote two passages from His *Principles of Sociology*. "The internal energy which in the experiences of the primitive man was always the immediate antecedent of changes wrought by him—that energy which, when interpreting external changes, he thought of along with those attributes



of a human personality connected with it in himself ; it is the same energy which, freed from anthropomorphic accompaniments, is now figured as the cause of all external phenomena. The last stage reached is recognition of the truth that force as it exists beyond consciousness cannot be like what we know within consciousness ; and, that yet, as either is capable of generating the other, they must be different modes of the same. Consequently the final outcome of the speculation commenced by the primitive man is that the Power manifested throughout the Universe distinguished as material is the same Power which in ourselves wells up under the form of consciousness. (*Principles of Sociology*, p. 839.) “ One truth must ever grow clearer—the truth that there is an Inscrutable Existence everywhere manifested, to which he can neither find nor conceive either beginning or end. Amid the mysteries which become the more mysterious the more they are thought about there will remain the one absolute certainty that he is ever in presence of an Infinite and Eternal Energy, from which all things proceed ” (p. 843).

Not to dwell on the fact that these passages follow, not from the agnostic element of Spencer's system, but from the positive constructive part, we note that those who had praised the agnostic statement in the *First Principles*, and called them the final word of human reason on these questions, protested that Spencer was untrue to his own philosophy, and had brought back again the metaphysical and theological ghosts which they thought had been banished for ever. There were many protests, but Spencer persisted in his affirmation of the Eternal Energy from which all things proceed. If these results be the final outcome, and the conclusions of Haeckel are not very different from them, then the result is a materialistic Monism, which is a Pantheism with special emphasis laid on the materialistic aspect of

the universe. Agnostic immanence is the outcome of the system. Spencer tried to conciliate all interests in his solution. Knowledge is not of the Ultimate Reality, but only of phenomena, that is of things as they appear in conscious experience, limited as this is by correlation with a specific nervous organism. He thought that he conserved the truth of the various systems of religion and philosophy when he conceded to the Agnostic that the Ultimate Reality was unknowable, while to the Theist and the religious instinct generally, he gave the assurance of an Infinite and Eternal Energy from which all things proceed. The demands of the religious consciousness were met by the presentation not of an anthropomorphic God transcendent of the world, but by an immanent God whose presence in the world might still nourish all the religious feelings, and feed the feelings of reverence, awe, and devotion, formerly evoked by belief in a personal God. How far agnostic Immanence can satisfy the religious need of man, we shall inquire presently. At present we take Spencer as the latest exponent of that type of pantheistic thought, which merges God in the world, and leaves no room for any proper life in the Eternal Energy from which all things proceed. The Energy has no meaning apart from its manifestations of itself within space and time. God is identified with the world, and has no meaning apart from the world.

JAMES IVERACH.

### *THE DESOLATION OF THE CROSS.*

(1) THE holiest spot for the Christian Church is Calvary ; the most sacred symbol is the Cross ; when in its most solemn ordinance it remembers its Founder, it is as dying. Immediately after the Resurrection the sacrifice of Christ

was moved into the central position of the thought and life of the Christian community. The inspired genius of Paul found its heaviest trust and its hardest task in the interpretation of the Cross. Whenever and wherever there have been in the history of the Christian Church times of refreshing from the Presence of the Lord, Christ has been again lifted up from the earth to draw all men unto Him. While theories of the atonement have varied from age to age, the saints of all ages have found pardon and peace through the precious blood of the Son of God. The Christian Church will lose its historical identity, will disown its spiritual heritage, will imperil its future in untried ways, when Jesus as Teacher and Example displaces Christ the Saviour through Sacrifice. Glorifying with the Christian Church in the Cross, we may ask ourselves whether the Christian Church has done all it could to understand the Cross by penetrating with reverence and sympathy and devotion into the "inner life" of the Crucified. The writer has the conviction that it is only thus that in some measure its profoundest depths of mystery can be sounded, and its sublimest heights of glory can be scaled; and it is, therefore, in humility and contrition of spirit that he addresses himself to his present task.

(2) After the Agony in Gethsemane there remained for Jesus to experience calmly and bravely what He had anticipated with such trouble and shrinking of soul. The Father's will having been accepted, the Father's help was not denied. The remonstrance at the treacherous kiss of Judas (Luke xxii. 48), the warning evoked by the hasty blow of Peter in His defence (Matt. xxvi. 52), the healing touch on Malchus (Luke xxii. 51), the reproachful question to the priests and scribes (verses 52, 53), the scathing rebuke of the secret methods of His enemies (John xviii. 20-23), the solemn confession in response to the High Priest's

challenge of His Messiahship (Matt. xxvi. 64), the compassionate treatment of Pilate in his weak vacillation (John xviii. 36-37, xix. 11), and the tender expression of sympathy with the womanhood of Jerusalem in anticipation of its nearing judgment (Luke xxiii. 28-31):—these suggest the burden He was bearing, and the struggle He was waging during these hours of unceasing trial to His spirit as well as of weakness and weariness of His flesh between the acceptance and the presentation of His sacrifice. The look that brought the denying Peter to bitter penitence (Luke xxii. 61), the silence which made Pilate marvel (Mark xv. 5) are not less significant than the words of Jesus. Conscious of His own greatness, confident of His own vocation, courageous in doing and daring all involved in its fulfilment, He was deeply grieved with human sin and unbelief, tenderly patient with ignorance and weakness, swiftly responsive to sympathy, and acutely sensitive to shame and pain. Even when it had been excusable if He had been absorbed in His own experience, He was interested in, and concerned about others.

(3) The utterances of Jesus on the Cross reveal to us His inner life, and thus give content to our conception of His sacrifice; for it is surely the sorrow and the struggle of His spirit, and not the pain of His body that gives significance and value to His offering of Himself to God on behalf of man. The genuineness of some of these sayings has been doubted. The cry of desolation is reported both in Matthew (xxvii. 46) and Mark (xv. 34), although probably the former gave the Hebrew form, and the latter the Aramaic equivalent. Bruce's note may be quoted: "The probability is that Jesus spoke in Hebrew. It is no argument against this that the spectators might not understand what He said, for the utterance was not meant for the ears of men. The historicity of the occurrence has been called in question on



the ground that one in a state of dire distress would not express his feelings in borrowed phrases. The alternative is that the words were put into the mouth of Jesus by persons desirous that in this as in all other respects His experience should correspond to prophetic anticipations. But who would have the boldness to impute to Him a sentiment which seemed to justify the taunt, 'Let Him deliver Him if He love Him'? Brandt's reply to this is: Jewish Christians who had not a high idea of Christ's Person. That in some Christian circles the cry of desertion was an offence appears from the rendering of 'eli, eli' in *Evangelium Petri*—*ἡ δύναμις μου ἡ δ. μ.* = my strength, my strength. Its omission by Luke proves the same thing" (*Expositor's Greek Testament*, pp. 331-2). The improbability of the words being put into the mouth of Jesus is so very great that we may confidently accept His well-attested saying as genuine.

(4) The prayer for forgiveness for His persecutors, the promise of Paradise to the penitent thief, the committal of His spirit unto God, are found in Luke's Gospel only (xxiii. 34, 43, 46); but this must not be assumed as a disproof of the genuineness of the utterances. Each must be considered on its own merits. Of the first Bruce says, "A prayer altogether true to the spirit of Jesus, therefore, although reported by Luke alone, intrinsically credible. It is with sincere regret that one is compelled, by its omission in important MSS., to regard its genuineness as subject to a certain amount of doubt. In favour of it is its conformity with the whole aim of Luke in his Gospel, which is to exhibit the graciousness of Jesus" (*op. cit.* pp. 639-640). May not the omission be due to the intense hostility felt in the Christian Church towards the murderers of Jesus? The saying is both fit for the occasion, and worthy of the person. While the second saying raises difficulties in regard



to the exact meaning to be assigned to the words "to-day" and "Paradise," the penitence of Jesus' companion in suffering and Jesus' comforting promise are not intrinsically improbable. As regards the third saying Bruce's comment is most suggestive. "This expression (*φωνῇ μεγάλῃ*) is used in Matthew and Mark, in connexion with the 'My God, My God,' which Luke omits. In its place comes the 'Father, into Thy hands.' Here, as in the Agony in the Garden, Luke's account fails to sound the depths of Christ's humiliation. It must not be inferred that he did not know of the 'Eli, eli.' Either he personally, or his source, or his first readers, could not bear the thought of it" (*op. cit.* p. 641). It does not follow that Jesus did not utter this "echo of Psalm xxxi. 6 as an expression of trust in God *in extremis*." It is probable that light broke through the darkness, and that despair gave place to confidence.

(5) The Fourth Gospel adds three other sayings: the commendation of His mother to John, the cry of bodily need, and the sigh of relief, or shout of triumph "It is finished" (xix. 26, 27; 28; 30). That these sayings are given only in the Fourth Gospel should not be allowed to raise a presumption against their genuineness. John, the beloved disciple, seems to have had closer connexions in Jerusalem than the other disciples, and he too seems to have lingered longest at the Cross. If the brethren of Jesus had remained unbelieving, and if the tragedy of the Cross was likely to harden their unbelief, it was most appropriate that Jesus should desire His mother to make her home with the disciple who would be most able to recall to her those tender reminiscences of Himself which would strengthen her faltering faith in Him. That this disciple alone reports the sacred charge need not awaken any doubt. Even if the confession of thirst is reported in this Gospel in opposition to the docetism which prevailed in the circles

to which it was addressed, we need not assume that it was invented for the purpose. One of the worst tortures of crucifixion was the burning thirst that accompanied it ; and if Jesus felt this torture, was it improbable that He gave expression to His needs ? John's reference to this cry as a fulfilment of prophecy is thus explained by Marcus Dodds : " Jesus did not feel thirsty and proclaim it with the intention of fulfilling scripture, which would be a spurious fulfilment, but in His complaint and the response to it, John sees a fulfilment of Psalm lxix. 22 " (*op. cit.* p. 858). There is nothing about the last word John catches from the dying lips of Jesus that need arouse any suspicion ; whether the word expressed His relief that the Passion was ended, or His satisfaction that His purpose was accomplished.

(6) Accepting the seven utterances from the Cross as genuine, we may now try to put them in the most appropriate order. The prayer for forgiveness there seems to be very little doubt was uttered as the soldiers were fastening Jesus to His Cross. Some time must have elapsed before the companion of Jesus was so impressed by the Person of the Crucified that unbelief was changed to faith, and the words of mockery gave place to the accents of entreaty. Later still the care for His mother found fit expression. Then there appears to have been silence on the Cross for three hours, while darkness shrouded the land. The cry of desolation broke the silence. When the inward struggle was ended, Jesus became aware of His physical anguish, to which His absorption in His spiritual agony had probably for a time made Him quite insensible, and He called for water. The strain of His inward struggle was relaxed even as the pain of His outward need was relieved ; and to this change of mood the two last utterances testify. We cannot be certain how to place them.

On the one hand, it does seem appropriate that the last word from the failing breath should be "It is finished." On the other, one is still more attracted to the conclusion that He died in the very act of faith, committing and submitting Himself to God. Nevertheless it was in that trustful and thankful surrender of Himself to His Father that Jesus finished His work; and, therefore, on the whole it is more probable that the word, "It is finished," should be placed last of all the sayings on the Cross. Great is our gain that, having refused the stupefying drink (Mark xv. 23), He endured His Cross in full consciousness, and so gave us this precious revelation of His "inner life."

(7) The scope of the prayer of Jesus for His enemies (Luke xxiii. 34) has been restricted to His Roman executioners (Smith's *The Days of His Flesh*); but that restriction does not seem to be in accord with the largeness of the love of Jesus. As He taught His disciples to bless all who cursed them, and to pray for all who persecuted them, He Himself forgave, and sought God's forgiveness for all who had done Him any wrong. Sometimes a man does not avenge his own wrongs, but hands over His enemies to the vengeance of God. While he will not himself take judgment into his own hands, he anticipates, it may be even with what he regards as righteous satisfaction, the punishment from God which awaits them (compare Romans xii. 19). This was not the spirit of Jesus. He Himself so freely forgave that He used the filial privilege to intercede with God for His foes. There is something surprising in this intercession. As the Son of Man He claimed authority on earth to forgive sins (Matt. ix. 6), and with absolute confidence He assured the penitent of the pardon of God. "Thy sins are forgiven. Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace" (Luke vii. 48, 50). Why, then, did He not Himself pronounce, instead of interceding for, the

pardon of His enemies ? His mode of address, "Father," shows that in His hour of trial His faith in God's love had not failed Him ; for His consciousness of God's fatherhood was too deep-rooted to be overthrown by any gusts of adversity. That God was willing and waited to forgive was an axiom with Jesus. How shall we explain the uncertainty that this intercession involves ? It may be that in every case in which Jesus forgave sin there had been this intercession, though voiceless, and that the assurance was given as swiftly as the divine response came ; but that in this case the divine response being delayed, the voiceless became articulate intercession. But why then this delay ? In the other cases there were present the desire for and faith to receive the pardon of God ; in this case sin was impenitent, and unbelief defiant. As in regard to the epileptic boy, whose cure was hindered by the unbelief of the disciples, of the father, of the multitudes, Christ had to put forth an increased energy of faith, such as would remove mountains (Matt. xvii. 20), so in this case His fervent intercession sought to make up for the lack in those for whom He prayed of the conditions on which the divine forgiveness depended. It was not because the wrongs were being inflicted on Himself that Jesus felt this difficulty of the divine pardon ; for "the personal equation" did not disturb His unerring moral judgment. But the heinousness and horror and hatefulness of the sins of His persecutors was so intensely and vividly realized by Him that it was hard even for Him to believe that there could be cleansing for such "crimes of deepest dye." His love made it impossible for Him, however, to acquiesce in the condemnation of His murderers. That His death as the sacrifice for man's salvation should have as its immediate consequence *perdition* for those who were the historical agents in bringing it about was an obscuration of its glory that His loving



heart could not endure. That in forcing the conflict between Himself and the leaders and teachers of His people to this final issue He was driving His foes to their doom (and such a doom !) imposed an intolerable stress on Jesus, from the excessive strain of which He could find relief only in this increased energy of faith in fervent intercession.

(8) The plea on their behalf, which He advances, appears at first sight as strange as the intercession itself is surprising. Jesus could not regard those who had a share in His death as so ignorant as to be irresponsible : He recognizes responsibility even in pleading for pardon. One can hardly believe that there was no resistance of conscience to the resolution of the rulers of the Jews to put Him to death : that the crime of His Cross appeared to all a meritorious deed. Blindness of mind and hardness of heart, due to selfish ambition and worldly policy, in some measure explain the action ; but for this inward condition the actors were themselves responsible. This deed against the Son of Man, nevertheless, was in Christ's gracious judgment a sin that could be forgiven ; although it came very near being that sin against the Spirit of God for which there is no forgiveness (Matt. xii. 31, 32). The resistance and rejection of divine truth, righteousness, and grace as presented in the Son of God must appear to us as "the eternal sin" (Mark iii. 29), as the final decision of the soul against God ; but Jesus Himself made allowance for the prejudice and passion, the religious traditions, and moral customs, that obscured the judgment and obstructed the will even of His enemies, and so made their action, heinous and hateful as it was, less damnable than it would have been if they had fully realized all that was involved in it. He committed His foes to the mercy of God, because He, interpreting the mind and heart of God, believed that God judged sin, not according to its objective character, as it appears in His



own sight or in the eyes of men even, but according to its subjective intention, the measure in which the sinner himself realizes its guilt.

(9) That such a prayer even for His foes was not altogether a "forlorn hope" was surely proved by the penitence of one of His companions on the Cross. The penitent thief, too, appeared fixed in sin and unbelief; at first he also joined in the mockery (Matt. xxvii. 44; Mark xv. 32); but a change was wrought in him. The silence and patience of Jesus, so unlike the behaviour of the tortured on the Cross, impressed him; the scoffing words about the Christ of God suggested an explanation; the shame and pain of his death, stimulated his conscience; a sense of need and a hope of help were awakened in him; his rebuke of his companion, and his appeal to Jesus (Luke xxiii. 40-42) gave expression to his saving faith. Probably his conception of the Kingdom of the Messiah, in which he longed for a share, was very crude; not larger and loftier than the popular expectations of a national emancipation and a political restoration; but while his opinions were not true, the attitude of his soul was right. To recognize the Messiah in the Crucified, to commit himself in his extremity of need to the sufficiency of grace of his fellow-sufferer, implied a vision and a vigour of faith that made him, even on his cross, a new creation, the old things having passed away, and all things having become new. To him apply Browning's words:

Oh, we're sunk enough here, God knows,  
But not quite so sunk that moments,  
Sure though seldom, are denied us,  
When the spirit's true endowments  
Stand out plainly from its false ones,  
And apprise it if pursuing  
Or the right way or the wrong way,  
To its triumph or undoing. *(Christina.)*

In such moments the bondage of the guilty past may be broken, and the promise of a better future may begin to have its fulfilment. The promise of Jesus, "Verily I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with Me in Paradise" (verse 43), was the appropriate response to the appeal; yet it corrects the expectation of the penitent in two respects. It is a present, not a future, boon that is promised; "a speedy release by death, instead of a slow, lingering process of dying, as often in cases of crucifixion." It is not a gain on earth, but a good in the unseen world that is assured; paradise is "either the division of Hades in which the blessed dwell, which would make for the *descensus ad inferos* or heaven." (Bruce in *Expositor's Greek Testament*, p. 641). The uncertainty about the meaning of the word *paradise* forbids the use of these words for the solution of the problem of the future life; the saying proves neither that there is an intermediate state in which believers await the resurrection, nor that saints at once pass to their final glory and blessedness. To use the promise of Jesus for any such dogmatic purpose is to miss its meaning, and to lose its worth. It should attract all our attention to, and concentrate it all on, Jesus Himself. During His earthly ministry He was sure of His Saviourhood, sure that even the worst who turned to Him in faith, and trusted in His grace, could be saved. Even on the Cross this certainty was not lost by Him. The taunt "He saved others; Himself He cannot save" (Matt. xxvii. 42) did not disturb the calm of His soul. Jesus, that He might save others, could not, and would not, save Himself. The case of this penitent was typical; the Cross of the sacrifice of Jesus was the throne of His Saviourhood. In uttering this promise Jesus not only comforted His companion, but He had Himself a foretaste of the joy that was set before Him, for which He endured the Cross, despising the shame.

(10) One element in the sacrifice which His Saviourhood involved is brought under our notice in Jesus' farewell to His mother. While His was a love, a care, a bounty, that reached to all men, none too great to have no need of Him, and none too low to be unheeded by Him, He had His own personal relationships of greater intimacy and deeper obligation ; and at the Cross two of His dearly loved ones made their unspoken claim for His comfort and help. Although under the influence of His unbelieving brethren, His mother even seems to have misunderstood Him, and to have held aloof from His ministry ; yet, when sorrow, shame, and suffering came upon Him, her mother-heart drew her to His side. She had not lost His love, but doubtless, as Jesus looked upon her from the Cross, the tender affection of the former years was revived. He yearned that she should find in Him, not a Son fondly loved, but a Saviour fully trusted, and a Lord freely obeyed ; He desired, as the best token of His love that He could bestow, that the natural relationship should give place to the spiritual union. In confiding her to His beloved disciple He took the means best adapted to this end. Who so fit as the disciple who understood better than any other His "inner life" to guide the mother, step by step, from the natural affection to the spiritual devotion ? Yet the words "Woman, behold thy son !—Behold thy mother !" (John xix. 26–27), as has already been shown in the *Seventh Study*, are full of pathos as well as promise. At the Cross mother and son were doubly bereaved ; there was not only the severance of death ; but the relationship of mother and son was ended. It is true that a holier bond was to take its place ; and yet we are surely not mistaken in supposing that for mother and son alike at the moment the loss seemed greater than the gain.

(11) The thoughts, feelings, and wishes of Jesus had

been, even on the Cross, turned outwards in loving interest in, and helpful concern for, others. He had prayed for the forgiveness of His foes ; He had assured the penitent of future good ; He had bequeathed His bereaved and beloved mother to the care and counsel of His disciple. But a moment came when His inward trial absorbed Him completely. Doubtless, as the agony of His body increased, so did the anguish of His soul. So closely related are the physical and the spiritual in man, so greatly is the soul affected by the condition of the body, that apart from the tortures of crucifixion it may be that the spirit of Jesus would not have descended into so abysmal depths of darkness and desolation. Be that as it may, the cry, " My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me ? " (Matt. xxvii. 46 ; Mark xv. 34) is not explicable by His bodily pain. He was never so mastered by His body as to lose His soul's good. Within and not without was the cause of this desolation. In the previous study on *the Agony in Gethsemane* the cry on the Cross is regarded as meaning what the words taken in their plain sense appear to mean, " the interruption of His filial communion with God, the obscuration of the gracious and glorious vision of God's Fatherhood." This view is, however, rejected by many scholars to-day. To give one instance, the late Professor Stevens, in his book, *The Theology of the New Testament*, writes : " The exclamation on the Cross must not be didactically pressed into an assertion that in His death God withdrew from Christ His favour and fellowship. The Psalm from which it is quoted (xxii. 1) suggests rather the idea of abandonment to suffering than of abandonment to desertion by God " (p. 134). This opinion is even more emphatically expressed in his last work, *The Christian Doctrine of Salvation* (p. 51). He declines with " the traditional theology " to understand " that cry as expressing Christ's sense of desertion by God

in His experience of bearing the world's sin." In these statements there is lacking careful discrimination. To affirm the subjective sense of desertion by God in Christ is not the same as to assert the objective fact of that desertion. The Father did not abandon His Son, although the Son felt Himself so abandoned. Calvin himself makes this distinction: "We do not indeed insinuate that God was either ever opposed to or angry with Him. For how could He be angry with His beloved Son, on whom His mind rested? or how could Christ, by His intercession, propitiate for others a Father whom He had as an enemy to Himself? This we say, that He sustained the gravity of divine severity; since, being stricken and afflicted by the hand of God, He experienced all the signs of an angry and punishing God" (*Institutes*, Book I., chapter xvi. 11). While there are terms used in this statement that we should now hesitate to use, yet it is extremely valuable as making from the side of theology a distinction which from the side of psychology is imperative. We cannot interpret religion aright unless we distinguish the relation of God to the soul from the reflexion of that relation in the soul; the latter does not always with absolute accuracy report the former. The inner life of Jesus was usually as the unruffled surface of the lake which mirrors clearly the sunny sky above; but there were times when, as the tempest-tossed waters give only a broken reflexion, so His feelings, troubled and distressed, did not represent God's relation to Him. Never was the Son dearer to the Father, or the Father nearer to the Son, than when in filial obedience He experienced in His own soul the darkness and desolation of God's apparent distance and desertion.

(12) That Jesus felt to the uttermost this being forsaken of God must be affirmed emphatically, in view especially of the dread with which He anticipated His experience



in Gethsemane. To declare that the words on the lips of Jesus meant no more than on the lips of the psalmist, because He felt no more than the psalmist did, is, it seems to the writer at least, irreverence towards Him. His vision of God was so much clearer, His communion with God so much closer, His affection for God so much deeper, that the abysmal depths of the Son's agony cannot be fathomed by the pain and grief of which saint or seer may be capable. We must agree with Mrs. Browning that this experience of Jesus was unique as His Person, whether we agree or not with her in regard to its purpose.

Yea, once, Immanuel's orphaned cry His universe hath shaken—  
It went up single, echoless, "My God, I am forsaken."  
It went up from the Holy's lips amid His last creation,  
That, of the lost, no son should use those words of desolation.

*Cowper's Grave.*

Deferring for the present the theological explanation can we give any psychological account of this experience? Such an attempt is often deprecated as an irreverent intrusion into the sanctuary of the soul. To the writer, however, it seems that the "inner life" of Jesus is both the revelation of God and the redemption of man, so that His experience is not a private possession, but a universal treasure. What has done injury to so many theories of the Atonement is just the failure to interpret it in the light of Jesus' own consciousness of His sacrifice. Avoiding the technical language of psychology, the writer would suggest that the experience of Jesus can be explained by two laws of the inner life, the law of *appropriating affection*, and the law of *absorbing attention*.

As has already been pointed out, love by its very nature as a giving of self to another so as not only to serve, but to suffer with another, is vicarious; it takes the other life into its own mind, heart, and will. The love of Jesus, in which there was no selfish narrowness or weakness, gave

itself thus fully and freely to others. The sorrows, needs, struggles, sins of others became a shadow, a burden, a strain, and a shame to Jesus. He loved Himself into oneness with mankind. Although He Himself knew no sin as personal guilt, He was made sin in experiencing to the full in His self-identification with sinners the consequences of sin. As the sting of death is sin, so He in His love for mankind tasted death for every man. It may be difficult for us to realize what His identification of Himself with mankind involved for Jesus; but as we become more unselfishly loving, does it become possible for us to feel the sin of mankind as our own grief and loss. On His Cross, where the world's sin was doing its worst against Him, He most fully realized its curse. Such an experience must absorb the attention. There are mutually exclusive ideas, emotions, and desires. May we borrow the terms of logic, and say that as the intention increases the extension contracts? The more intense the more restricted must the consciousness be. The absorption of Jesus in the sin of mankind meant the withdrawal of His attention from other objects. Not only so, this experience of the misery and shame and doom of sin necessarily excluded the help and comfort of God's fatherly love. The cloud was too thick to let the sunshine break through. Man's sin and God's Fatherhood exclude one another in so intense an experience as Jesus passed through on the Cross. The realization of the one obscured the other.

(13) In rejecting this view of the cry of desolation, Professor Stevens insists on interpreting it "on the basis of Jesus' teaching alone." (*The Christian Doctrine of Salvation*, p. 52.) But there is good reason for challenging this arbitrary restriction. The immaturity and inexperience of the disciples and the multitude imposed a restraint on Jesus' teaching for which due allowance must be made. Further,

it is possible that the reality of the sacrifice of Jesus depended on the limitation even of His own knowledge of all that it involved. He walked by faith and not by sight. In Gethsemane He was bewildered: "If it be possible, let this cup pass away from Me" (Matt. xxvi. 39). On Calvary He pleads, "Why hast Thou forsaken Me?" Had there been present to the mind of Jesus a logical demonstration of the necessity of His death, the trial would not have been so severe, nor would the trust have been so triumphant. It was religious faith and moral obedience which carried Him through "the hour and the power of darkness." To expect from Jesus Himself a theory of the Atonement, and to reject the subsequent apostolic doctrine of the Cross wherever it goes beyond the words of Jesus is to ignore the necessary conditions for such a sacrifice of vicarious love. The value of His sacrifice must be experienced in Christian life before the significance of the Cross could be interpreted by Christian thought. It was the Spirit of God who guided the apostolic Church into all the truth about the death of Christ. We have a right then, nay, it is our duty to turn to the apostolic teaching, especially the doctrine of Paul, to whom the Cross meant more than to any of the other apostles, that we may learn the whole meaning and the full worth of the experience of Jesus as expressed in this cry. What Christian thought has found in this experience of desolation and darkness is expressed in such apostolic sayings as these: "Him who knew no sin He made to be sin on our behalf; that we might become the righteousness of God in Him" (2 Cor. v. 21); "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us" (Gal. iii. 13); "That by the grace of God He should taste death for every man"; "That through death He might bring to nought him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and might deliver all them

who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage" (Heb. ii. 9, 14, 15); "Who His own self bare our sins in His body upon the tree, that we, having died unto sins, might live unto righteousness; by whose stripes ye were healed" (1 Peter ii. 24). These sayings cannot mean less than that Jesus, Himself sinless, endured the consequences of sin even unto the sense of desertion by God. He was not held guilty, nor was He punished by God, for these terms cannot apply to the sinless; but God willed that He should experience in its entirety the final issue of sin. How this was possible an endeavour has at least been made to show psychologically; why this, and nothing less, was necessary all theories of the Atonement attempt to prove theologically. This task lies beyond the scope of the present purpose; but the writer feels constrained to add, that his own conviction is ever deepening, that God's holy love required for its own satisfaction that in the very act of divine forgiveness through the Cross the ultimate consequence of sin as expressive of God's judgment (the judgment of holy love) should be made manifest. It was the Holy Father who willed, and it was the Holy Son who chose the drinking of this cup.

(14) The cry which expressed also relieved the agony of soul. The appeal to God like a mighty wind scattered the clouds that hid the sunshine of God. The inward tension relaxed, Jesus realized His bodily need. His complaint "I thirst" (John xix. 28) reminds us of the physical torture in manifold forms which He was enduring. Against the docetism, which assigned to Him only the semblance of a body, this utterance bore witness; and probably it is for this reason that it is reported by the Evangelist. If in the popular use of the phrase "the blood of Jesus" undue emphasis is laid on the physical aspects of the sacrifice of Jesus, in common Christian thought the

completeness of the humanity of Jesus is often ignored, and as a correction of this tendency this saying has still significance. It suggests one consideration which deserves brief mention. In savage races the endurance of bodily need and suffering without a murmur is regarded as heroic. Stoicism made a virtue of indifference to pleasure and pain alike. In the records of Christian martyrdom we meet often with instances of even a morbid craving for physical tortures. In former times there seems to have been a greater insensibility in inflicting as in submitting to pain. This cry of Jesus shows that the sinless perfection did not exclude an acute sensibility to, and did not prohibit a frank acknowledgment of, bodily suffering. It is not a weak sentimentalism which makes us to-day feel so much more keenly for the sufferings of others, even their bodily needs. Jesus felt hunger and thirst, and made known His wants. In His miracles He relieved the sufferings of the body. Even on His Cross He has hallowed bodily wants by sharing them, as in His ministry He consecrated their relief.

(15) Just as the release from spiritual desolation allowed the physical anguish to be felt, so the relief of the bodily need seems to have calmed and soothed the soul of the Crucified. The descent of the Son of God into the depths of desolation and darkness had been accomplished, and the ascent to the heights of the love and the light of God had commenced before physical dissolution. The filial consciousness was restored, and the filial confidence was exercised in His self-committal unto God. "Father, into Thy hands I commend My spirit" (Luke xxiii. 46). It may be doubted whether we are entitled to put into the words the meaning that "Jesus died by a free act of will, handing over His soul to God as a deposit to be kept safe (Grotius, Bengel, Hahn)" (Bruce in *Expositor's Greek Testament*, p. 642).



That Jesus, in obedience to God, chose to die, and did not merely submit to compulsion by men is a truth on which the Fourth Evangelist especially lays stress (John x. 18). But that His death was the necessary conclusion of the physical process already begun, and was not brought about by an act of His will, is more probable. He died willingly ; He consented and did not merely submit to His death ; but it was not necessary for Him to will to die. Dismissing, then, this explanation, the words may be taken as expressive of filial trust in, and surrender to, God. As such the words are inexpressibly valuable to us as following on the cry of desolation. He did not pass into the mystery of the unseen world under the shadow of God hidden, but in the light of the Father revealed. He did not perish in death. He was saved from death in that when physical dissolution came upon Him, His heart was stayed on God, whose rod and staff did comfort Him.

(16) Whether the word "It is finished" was a sigh of relief or a shout of triumph it is not possible nor necessary for us to decide. That His Passion was ended consoled Him, that His Purpose was accomplished satisfied Him. Both feelings were probably blended ; but perhaps the triumph was more prominent than the relief. It is a saying that Christian faith can rest in. Christ by His Spirit is still living, working, and reigning in His Church, and through His Church, in the world ; but on Calvary a work was ended that needs no repetition and bears no imitation. "The death that He died, He died unto sin once" (Rom. vi. 10). "This He did once for all, when He offered up Himself" (Heb. vii. 27). When Paul speaks of filling up "that which is lacking of the afflictions of Christ" (Col. i. 24), and desires to know "the fellowship of Christ's sufferings, becoming conformed unto His death" (Phil. iii. 10), he assuredly has no thought of an incomplete sacrifice, or an

unaccomplished salvation. For Christ as for the apostles the propitiation, expiation, atonement was no permanent, universal process ; it was a solitary single act of the Incarnate Son of God on the Cross of Calvary. The working out of the salvation fills the centuries ; the salvation itself as accomplished in the sacrifice of Christ is, according to His own witness in dying, finished. To the lives of most men death comes as an interruption of effort, arrest of development, severance of affections ; to Jesus it came as a course run, a task done, a trust kept, a triumph won ; for the death itself was the baptism wherewith He was to be baptized, and He was straitened till it was accomplished. In dying He fulfilled His vocation. A. E. GARVIE.

*THE DEMONOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT,  
ILLUSTRATED FROM THE PROPHETICAL  
WRITINGS.*

I.

IN a former article <sup>1</sup> some reasons were given for believing that the existence of an Old Testament Demonology was to be looked for on *a priori* grounds. Some suggestions were also made to account for the, comparatively speaking, few references to the subject in the Old Testament ; though it was maintained that these references are larger in number than is usually assumed. Moreover, various details of the agreement between Arab, Babylonian and Jewish Demonology were given, in order to show that it is only by means of the comparative method that the many indirect references to the subject in the Old Testament are to be discerned.

It is desired to lay stress on the fact that the passages now to be considered do not in any sense profess to be exhaustive ; they are only given as illustrations of what a deeper study of the subject may be expected to afford. As hinted in the former article, such subjects as Animism, Ancestor-

<sup>1</sup> THE EXPOSITOR, April, 1907.

worship, with its remains in the various mourning customs, and Serpent-worship, which is so plainly stated to have existed among the Israelites,<sup>1</sup> are all so inextricably mixed up with the belief in demons, that it would require a detailed consideration of these from the point of view of their relation to Demonology to realize to an adequate extent the existence, so often assumed though unexpressed, of Demonology in the Old Testament.

The first passage to be examined is :

*Isaiah* xiii. 21, 22.

*But wild beasts of the desert shall lie there ; and their houses shall be full of doleful creatures ; and ostriches shall dwell there ; and satyrs shall dance there. And wolves shall cry in their castles, and jackals in the pleasant palaces. . . .* It is important to note here first of all that among the characteristics common to Semitic Demonology are these two, as pointed out above : demons existed in great numbers, and were believed to have a special predilection for desert places, and especially for ruined sites where men used to dwell, and where presumably their spirits were still hovering about (as to the identity or otherwise of demons and some of the spirits of the departed, see below). The passage before us is preceded by the words : *It* (i.e. Babylon) *shall never be inhabited, neither shall it be dwelt in from generation to generation : neither shall the Arabian pitch tent there, neither shall shepherds make their flocks to lie down there.*

The site described, therefore, is just such a one as popular imagination would people with demons. A brief examination of the names given to the queer creatures conceived of as dwelling here will be found instructive.

<sup>1</sup> 2 Kings xviii. 4 : *He (Hezekiah) brake in pieces the brazen serpent that Moses had made ; for unto those days the children of Israel did burn incense to it. . . .* Cf. the brazen serpent found under the Temple during the Gezer excavations, *PEFQ*, 1903, pp. 222 ff.

צִי: the root from which this word is usually supposed to be derived (צִיָּה) means "to be dry"; and the noun, in accordance with its usage, would mean something connected with a dry place, an inhabiter of the desert; the verbs used in connexion with it help very little: רָבַץ, "to lie down," is used of men as well as of animals; פָּגַשׁ, "to meet," is used of friendly as well as inimical encounters, mostly of men, very rarely of animals; יָשַׁב, "to dwell" or "settle down" (and other allied meanings), is a word of such common occurrence that it offers no help. An important point to notice about the word צִיִּים is that it does not exist in the singular. We have, therefore, these *data* regarding the צִיִּים: they cannot refer to men, nor are they to be identified with any known animals, they are always spoken of as dwelling in desert places and ruined sites, and, with one exception,<sup>1</sup> are always mentioned in connexion with other strange beasts, to be referred to presently.

אָה: this word, which is parallel to צִיִּים, and likewise used in the plural, is a ἄπ. λέγ., and comes from the root אָהָה, "to howl." According to Delitzsch<sup>2</sup> *ahû* is the Assyrian for "jackal," but this is disputed by other scholars. Very little help is gained from the *Septuagint*, ἡχου, or the *Syro-Hexaplar*, which merely translates the *Septuagint* literally; one is, however, reminded of the "howling wilderness" (Deut. xxxii. 10); among the Arabs the wilderness is said "to speak," by which is meant the mysterious humming, buzzing noise characteristic of the desert, and which they ascribe to demons; from this point of view the *Syro-Hexaplar* rendering (ܐܚܝܝܢ) is interesting. But one sees the indefiniteness and uncertainty which surround the meaning of the word, and it is just herein that its signifi-

<sup>1</sup> The exception is Psalm lxxiv. 14, where the text is obviously corrupt; but some old myth seems to be referred to concerning the דִּיִּים feeding on Leviathan.

<sup>2</sup> *Assyrisches Wörterbuch*, s.v.

cance lies. We turn next to the expression בְּנוֹת יַעֲנָה, which the Revised Version translates "ostriches"; it means literally "daughters of greed," and is, with two exceptions, used in the plural only; the בְּנוֹת יַעֲנָה is reckoned among the "unclean" animals in Leviticus xi. 16, Deuteronomy xiv. 15. There can be little doubt that in later times the word did come to mean "ostrich" (both Aquila and Symmachus render it στρουθοκαμήλοι, according to Q<sup>mg</sup> in the passage before us), but one may be permitted to doubt whether this meaning originally attached to the word; the *Septuagint* renders it σειρήνες in this passage and makes it parallel to δαιμόνια, but in other passages we find στρουθῶν (Isa. xxxiv. 13; Job xxx. 29), θυγατέρες στρουθῶν (Isa. xliii. 20), θυγατέρες σειρήνων (Mic. i. 8; Jer. l. 39 [xxvii. 39 in the LXX]), and σειρήνες is used for other Hebrew words of doubtful meaning; in short, out of the general confusion only one certain thing issues, and that is that the whole matter is veiled in obscurity. But here again it is the uncertainty and mystery of the subject that is just the significant part. One small point is worth recalling, however, and that is that the root עָנָה contains the idea of "greed" (cf. the Syriac ܥܢܢܐ *avidus*<sup>1</sup>); according to Arab belief demons have the hunger of a lion.<sup>2</sup> There follow then, in our passage, the words:—

וְשִׁעִירִים יִרְקְדוּ-שָׁם, "and satyrs shall dance there"; these *se'irim* were what the Revised Version calls "he-goats" in the margin, hairy beings who were probably conceived of as composite in form, for the Arabs believed in the existence of hairy hybrid monsters among the demons.<sup>3</sup> It is the same word as the ordinary Hebrew word

<sup>1</sup> Brockelmann, *Lex. Syr.*

<sup>2</sup> Wellhausen, *op. cit.* p. 149; on the other hand, they believed that demons rode on ostriches.

<sup>3</sup> R.S. p. 120.



for "goat," but when it occurs in connexions such as the passage before us, it is clear that it cannot mean a goat in the usual sense, especially when the word קָרַח is used with it (to "dance" or "skip about"), and when the *se'irim* are described as "calling out" to one another, as in Isaiah xxxiv. 14. The root שָׁעַר means "to be hairy," which accounts for the rendering of Aquila, who gives *τριχιώται*, and Theodotion, who renders *ὀρθοτριχοῦντες*; the *Septuagint* has simply the blunt *δαιμόνια*, though in 2 Chronicles xi. 15 it has *τοῖς εἰδώλοις*,<sup>1</sup> and in Leviticus xvii. 7 *τοῖς ματαίοις*. In Leviticus xvii. 7 we read of sacrifices being offered to the he-goats or satyrs; <sup>2</sup> from verse 5 we learn that these sacrifices were offered in the "open field," and that oxen, lambs and goats (v. 3) were sacrificed. These שְׁעִירִים<sup>3</sup> were probably, therefore, a class of desert-demons, "hairy" being their chief characteristic rather than goat-shaped, to judge from Arab analogy; like all "classes" of demons in Semitic Demonology they probably had a leader, and Azazel is the one to whom we should naturally look as such. The derivation of this word is much disputed, but that it is a personal name is undoubted, for, according to Leviticus xvi. 8-10, a goat is offered to him just as to Jahwe; the *Se'irim*, as we have seen, received offerings of goats, as well as of other animals. That Azazel

<sup>1</sup> The passage probably contains a doublet, *τοῖς εἰδώλοις καὶ τοῖς ματαίοις*.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Deut. xxxii. 17: *They sacrificed unto demons, which were no God*, see also Hos. xii. 12: *Is Gilead iniquity? They are altogether vanity; in Gilgal they sacrifice unto demons* (amended reading): *yea their altars are as heaps in the furrows of the field*. With this one may compare the Babylonian custom referred to in the following text: "Thou shalt prepare three altars, for the house god, the house goddess and the house demon, three sacrifices of lambs shalt thou sacrifice"; Zimmern, *Beiträge zur Kenntniss der Bab. Rel.* (Leipzig, 1901), quoted by Curtiss, *op. cit.* p. 54. The worship of demons is carried on at the present day in Mesopotamia; sacrifices are offered to them in order to avert evil, see *Jeremias*, p. 218.

<sup>3</sup> The word occurs in the sense of "Satyr" or "Hairy-one" at least four times in the Old Testament, probably oftener originally, for in 2 Kings xxiii. 8, e.g., שְׁעִירִים should be pointed שְׁעִירִים.

is a desert-spirit, like the *Se'irim*, is clear from Leviticus xvi. 21, 22,<sup>1</sup> and that he is an evil spirit is also clear, both on account of his antithesis to Jahwe, and on account of the "scape-goat" laden with the nation's sins being sent to him in the desert, the abode κατ' ἐξοχήν, of evil spirits. Thus, though the biblical *data* regarding the *Se'irim* and Azazel<sup>2</sup> are scanty, we may gather that the latter occupied a position in some sense parallel to the Babylonian Utukku or Ekimmu who, with their followers (with whom the *Se'irim* would correspond), were believed to frequent desert places (see (e) (h) above).

We come now to another class of creatures, called אַיִם (R.V. "wolves"); it is very difficult to say what was intended to be understood by this word; the root אָוָה means to "howl" or "screech" (a word for "hawk" comes from the same root); in view of the fact that many birds were regarded as the incarnations of demons, it may be that a bird of prey of some kind is intended. The *ὄνοκένταυροι* of the *Septuagint* shows to what straits these translators were driven, though the word is interesting as illustrating the belief that hybrid monsters were among the forms in which demons appeared; the *Syro-Hexaplar* merely transliterates the Greek, but the *Peshitta* has ܐܘܬܐܝܢ ܕܥܝܢܐ, which could just as well refer to "screechers" as to "howlers." The parallel word in our passage, ַאֲיִם, "jackals," would indeed favour the R.V. rendering of אַיִם, viz. "wolves" (though the parallels in the earlier part of the verse are

<sup>1</sup> According to Hommel (*AHT*, p. 280) the word comes from the Arabic root *azala*, "which embodies the idea of barrenness and infinity associated with the desert."

<sup>2</sup> In the *Book of Enoch* (see Dr. Charles' edition, 1893) Azazel is identified with one of the sons of God (Gen. vi. 1 ff.; see *Enoch*, vi. 1 f., viii. 1, ix. 6, x. 4-8; cf. lxxxviii. 1), xiii. 1, liv. 5, lv. 4; in this last passage Azazel is identified with Satan). See also the Mishnah tractate *Yoma*, 66a, 66b, Fiebig's edition, pp. 21-23.

“ostriches” and “goats”), but it cannot be said that we have any certainty regarding the meaning of תַּנִּינִים, for which the *Septuagint* gives the following varieties of rendering in the fourteen instances in which it occurs in the Hebrew: ἐχῖνοι, σειρήνες, στρουθῶν, δράκοντες, δόματα<sup>1</sup> (obviously a misreading), κακωσέως<sup>2</sup> (a different reading from the present Hebrew text); in another case, Isaiah xxxv. 7, the text is corrupt, and in one instance (Jer. li. 37) the *Septuagint* simply omits.

In studying this passage the conviction gains ground that it refers from beginning to end to what were believed to be demons, or, more strictly speaking, animals which were looked upon as the incarnations of demons. In connexion with it one has to bear in mind what was said above as to the general Semitic belief that ruined sites were inhabited by demons, see (b), and that all demons were conceived of as normally dwelling in animals, this being the way in which the Babylonians explained the problem as to where the permanent abode of demons was, see (g).

Together with the passage with which we have been dealing there are a number of others which should be studied; we can here, however, do no more than give the references: Isaiah xxxiv. 13–16, xxxv. 7, xliii. 20 (cf. Job xxx. 29, 30, Lam. iv. 3), Jeremiah ix. 10–12, x. 22, xlix. 33, l. 39, 40; in this last passage, after some words very similar to Isaiah xliii. 21, 22, it continues: *As when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah and the neighbour cities thereof, saith the Lord; so shall no man dwell there, neither shall any son of man sojourn there.* In connexion with this we may recall what was said above concerning the “vale of Siddim,” which should probably be the “vale of Shedim” (“Demons”), see Genesis xiv. 3, 8, 10. Further, we have the passages Ezekiel xxix. 5, 11, 12, xxxii. 2 ff., both of which

<sup>1</sup> Mal. i. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Ps. xliv. 20.

seem to imply that the Egyptians are to be delivered over to the power of the demons ; the verses contain several expressions which most probably, at all events in the popular imagination, referred to demons (cf. Isa. xvii. 13, 14). Micah i. 8, 10, where there is a use of expressions which refer to what would indicate "possession" ; with the words "I have rolled myself in the dust," compare 1 Samuel xix. 24, where we are told that Saul "lay down naked all that day and all that night." This is stated to be due to the "spirit of God" coming upon him, but, as already pointed out in the former article, there is reason to believe that actions which most likely were originally ascribed to demons working independently, were later on attributed, in the interests of Jahwe-worship, to the action of God Himself. The passage from 1 Samuel would seem to illustrate this. And lastly, there are the two further references, Zephaniah ii. 14, 15, Malachi i. 3.<sup>1</sup> As already pointed out, all these passages should be studied in connexion with the details which we have dealt with in Isaiah xiii. 21, 22.

## II.

We have seen reason to believe that Arab and Babylonian belief and practice regarding demons offer many analogies to Old Testament demonology. It is also certain that, for reasons given above, the part that belief in demons played among the Israelites is often obscured in the Old Testament, so that we have to look to these Arab and Babylonian analogies in order to understand the real meaning and significance of many an Old Testament passage or word. This is especially true of certain classes of persons, both men and women, to which we are now going to refer ; for the Hebrew words used to denote these classes are rare ones, and their exact meaning is not always clear ; so that

<sup>1</sup> Some other references will be seen in the article on Psalm xci.



it is only when we examine the accounts of similar persons who existed among the Arabs and Babylonians that we can gain some insight into the meaning of the names of their Old Testament equivalents.

According to Arab belief it was possible to demand the presence of a demon ; and conversely, it was believed that there were means of banishing a demon whose presence was harmful. There were certain men and women who were believed to know the secrets whereby power could be exercised over demons. Moreover, there were women who leagued themselves with demons, with the result that the latter took up their abode in them ; women, that is to say, who were believed to be the incarnations of demons. It is said that women of this kind used to ride naked on sticks among the tombs round about Schaizar.<sup>1</sup> They are believed at the present day to ride in a similar manner through the air in the neighbourhood of Chaibar.<sup>2</sup> The significant thing about these demon-incarnations is that they are brought into direct connexion with *sin* ; they tempt men to evil ; it is said that they compel the men they meet with to commit sin with them ; if the men refuse, their blood is sucked out, or they are turned into animals,<sup>3</sup> or made mad.<sup>4</sup> This lust which is imputed to demons (or their incarnations) accords fully with Jewish belief ; it originated possibly from an old myth which, one cannot help feeling, was not, in the first instance, an exclusively Hebrew possession, that, namely, contained in Genesis vi. 1-8 ; the later Jewish theology traced the origin of demons to the offspring of the unions referred to in this passage.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Wellh. 159.

<sup>2</sup> Doughty, *op. cit.* ii. 106 f.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> The connexion between demons and madness is one often referred to ; originally, prophetic frenzy must often have been regarded as due to demoniac influence ; cf. the reference to Saul above, and see Hos. ix. 7 ; John vii. 20, viii. 48, 49, x. 20.

<sup>5</sup> *Jalkut Shimeoni*, Bereshith, 44. Cf. *Book of Enoch*, chaps. vi. vii. According to another account, after the scattering of the nations (Gen.



But it was naturally far more important to use whatever power there was over demons, in the direction of banning, rather than in that of calling them up; the help of a demon might sometimes be sought for injuring an enemy, but far oftener the need lay in the direction of getting rid of him (the demon). The man who had the power of banishing demons of sickness was called *Tahib*, "the wise man,"<sup>1</sup> and was equivalent to a magician. Wellhausen points out (*op. cit.* 161) that the chief word used for healing a man, namely *Ruqa*,<sup>2</sup> comes from a root meaning "to quiet" or "to cause repose"; the reference being, no doubt, to the result after exorcising the demon. Methods of exorcism were of varied character among the Arabs, but the chief requirement was the recital of a formula; sometimes the formula would consist of only a few words, at other times it was more elaborate.

Turning now for a moment to Babylonian belief and practice, we find almost exact parallels; there are certain classes of men—especially such categories of priests as the *mashmashu* and *ashifu*—and of women who know how to coerce demons, and the methods they use are again chiefly the recitation of special formulae. But what is of pointed interest about these formulae is that they had to be "whispered," and it was only the initiated, those who "knew," who could effectively whisper the formula. The whispering was accompanied by various symbolic acts, chief among which was the tying and untying of a knot; this represented that the man who had been "bound" by a demon was by the symbolic act "unbound" or released<sup>3</sup>; but such acts

xi. 1-9) God turned them into demons (*Jalk. Shim. Beresh.* 62), who were thus half human and half demon.

<sup>1</sup> Wellh. 161. For the Old Testament counterpart, see below.

<sup>2</sup> He compares the Aramaic ܪܩܐ.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Luke xviii. 16, *And ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan had bound, lo, these eighteen years, to have been loosed from this bond on the day of the Sabbath?* It is interesting to recall here

of imitative magic could only be accomplished with success when performed by one who "knew" how to do it. It was specially important that these ceremonies should take place at certain definite times, otherwise they might not be effective; these times were early dawn, the third watch of the night, evening time and at midnight.<sup>1</sup> We shall have to return to this subject briefly when dealing with the ninety-first Psalm.

To apply what has been said to the Old Testament, we have here a number of words the meaning of some of which is sometimes doubtful, but taking them altogether it will be seen that the classes of persons to whom they refer are in most cases analogous to the Arab and Babylonian classes to which attention has just been drawn.

**הַאֲטִים**: this word only occurs once in the Old Testament, Isaiah xix. 3, where it is used of a class of magicians among the Egyptians; it comes from the root **אטט**, which, on Arabic analogy, means "to mutter";<sup>2</sup> closely connected with these "mutterers" were some other classes, **הָאֲבוֹת** ("familiar spirits"), **הַיִּדְעָנִים** ("wizards"), **מְצַפְצְפִים** ("whisperers"), **הַמְּהַלְלִים** ("mutterers"). The first of these, which the Revised Version translates "familiar spirits," comprise both men and women; e.g. Isaiah xxix. 4, where it is apparently used of a man, 1 Samuel xxviii. 7, where we have the expression **אִשֶּׁת בַּעַל־אִיב**, "a woman that is mistress of necromancy," or Leviticus xx. 27, *A man also or a woman that hath a familiar spirit (אִיב), or that is a wizard, shall surely be put to death.* This

the "find" made at Tell Sandahannah a few years ago; this consisted of sixteen little leaden figures, of from two to three inches in length, representing persons tied by fetters, some of the bodies being fearfully contorted; on the same spot were exhumed fifty tablets in soft stone bearing Greek inscriptions, consisting of magical charms and incantations. This is a pointed illustration of what has been said above. See *PEFQS*, 1900, pp. 332 ff., 1901, pp. 57, 58.

<sup>1</sup> *Ow lit.* pp. 147 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Oxford Hebrew Lexicon*, s.v.

seems to be precisely parallel to one of the classes referred to above, individuals in whom it was believed that demons took up their abode.<sup>1</sup> In the Old Testament they seem to be restricted to dealings with the departed; but it will have been seen above that an intimate connexion was often believed to exist between demons and the departed, a fact which seems to be witnessed to in 2 Kings xxiii. 24, *Moreover them that had familiar spirits, and the wizards, and the teraphim, and the idols, and all the abominations that were spied in the land of Judah and in Jerusalem, did Josiah put away.* . . . The next class, the "wizards," seem to be those who "know," the reference being either to intimate acquaintance with the demons or spirits, or else to the knowledge required for the purposes of calling up a demon or banishing him. The word **הידענים** is only used of men, but a parallel class is perhaps referred to in Jeremiah ix. 17 (16 in the Hebrew), where we read of **החכמות**, "the wise women" (cf. 2 Sam. xiv. 2, xx. 16). The **ידעני** may possibly be the Old Testament counterpart of the "Tahib" of the Arabs, referred to above. The onomatopoeic word **צפף**, which only occurs in the *pilpel*, is descriptive of the method of communication with the world of spirits adopted by yet another class of necromancers; it means "to chirp," and is used primarily of the twitter of birds, cf. Isaiah xxxviii. 14, where the parallel word **הנה** also occurs; the name **המצפצפים**, like **המהנים**, must therefore refer to the strange noises made by these would-be speakers with demons and the like (cf. Isa. viii. 19).

<sup>1</sup> With the story of the witch of Endor, out of whom presumably the familiar spirit spoke, compare the following: Sa'id b. Chalid fell sick every year, and lay apparently dead; they sought to cure him, but a voice ("the female genius of the illness") spoke out of him and said: "I am Karima, the daughter of Milhans, prince of the *Ginn*; if you cure him, it will be his death; had I found one nobler than he, I should have fallen in love with such a one." Wellh. 161. This speaking out from a person possessed is parallel to such an example as that contained in Mark i. 24, 25.

In Isaiah xlvii. 9-12 we read of "the multitude of thy sorceries (כְּשָׁפֶיךָ) and the great abundance of thine enchantments" (חֲבֵרֶיךָ), the reference being to the Chaldaeans. The enormous numbers of Assyrian and Babylonian magic texts which have been discovered form an interesting commentary on the prophet's words. The Hebrew word translated "sorcery" (כְּשָׁף) is a very significant expression; according to Robertson Smith it is used of shredded herbs of which a magic brew was concocted.<sup>1</sup> Herbs employed in this way, or else burned, were firmly believed by the Arabs to cure various diseases, i.e. demons were driven out by these means. According to the same authority<sup>2</sup> the Syriac ܐܬܟܫܫܫܦ (ethkashshaph), "to make supplication," means literally "to cut oneself." Now at the present day among the Arabs it is the custom to sprinkle blood on various occasions in order to quiet demons;<sup>3</sup> although the blood used for these purposes is that of animals, it is exceedingly probable that at one time human blood was used, men cutting themselves and thus employing their own blood; this was done by the priests of Baal (1 Kings xviii. 28), and it is well known that in later times the Jews looked upon the gods of the heathen as demons.<sup>4</sup> At all events these "sorceries" must, judging from Arab and Babylonian analogy, have been practised with the object of coercing demons. The parallel expression, חֲבַר, contains the root idea of "tying a knot" (cf. Deut. xviii. 11; Ps. lviii. 6), which, as we have seen, belongs essentially to demonology. Two other words require a passing notice in this connexion;<sup>5</sup> in Isaiah xlvii. 11,

<sup>1</sup> Cf., for the same idea, Isa. lxx. 4, "the broth of abominable things," though the word for broth here is a different one, מֶרֶק (kethibh מֶרֶק).

<sup>2</sup> R.S. 321. <sup>3</sup> Wellh. 127, cf. Curtiss, *op. cit.* chaps. xv., xvi.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. 1 Cor. x. 20, 21.

<sup>5</sup> The roots קָסַם and לָנָן (Jer. xxvii. 9, xxix. 8; Ezek. xiii. 9-17, xi. 23, xxi. 22, 23 [Hebr. 27, 28]; cf. Isa. iii. 2 f.; Exod. xxii. 17), may in some cases be applicable here, but this is quite uncertain.



there occur the words: *thou shalt not know the dawning thereof* (שִׁחַרְהִי), for which the R.V. mg. gives more correctly "... how to charm away"; the Arabic equivalent of this word שַׁחַר is the regular term used of the magic practised by the classes of men and women referred to above, who were supposed to have the power of calling up demons and of exorcising them.<sup>1</sup> The other word is נִחַשׁ, "to practise divination"; it is apparently an onomatopoeic word meaning originally "to hiss," and is from the same root as that from which the word for "serpent" (נָחָשׁ) comes. The study of this word would open out rather a large subject, which it would be impossible to deal with unless separately treated. It must suffice to say, in the first place, that, as already pointed out, the connexion between demons and serpents is such that they are almost inseparable; and, in the second place, that a connexion, perhaps an identity, is to be traced between the serpent, the dragon, the deep, and possibly Leviathan and Rahab; in fact, it would bring us face to face with the whole subject of Dualism, the belief in the antagonistic powers of Light and Darkness; that this is germane to the subject of demonology is obvious, but it will also be obvious that it is quite impossible to deal with it even cursorily without making this article inordinately long.<sup>2</sup>

### III.

In the list of women's ornaments enumerated in Isaiah iii. 18-24 there are some which, it may be safely said, were not worn only for ornamental purposes. In verse 20 there is the mention of הַלְלָחִשִּׁים, "amulets." The word occurs in the singular in Isaiah iii. 3, where it is translated "enchanter," in Jeremiah viii. 17, and Psalm lviii. 5 (6 in

<sup>1</sup> Wellh. 159 f.

<sup>2</sup> See on the whole subject Gunkel's *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit* (Göttingen, 1895).



Hebr.) of serpents that will not be "charmed," and in Isaiah xxvi. 16, where the Revised Version renders it "prayer." The root idea of the word is "to whisper";<sup>1</sup> a charm or incantation was, as we have seen, always whispered or mumbled, and these amulets either had a few words or one word, or even a letter, inscribed on them, or else they enclosed some fragments of a magic herb. In the former case the word would presumably be taken from the whispered charm, in the latter the fragments would be from the herbs which, as already pointed out, were burned during the recital of the incantation; or possibly some of the ashes of the burned herbs were enclosed. Amulets contained sometimes less agreeable remains.<sup>2</sup> In the same passage of Isaiah we have mention of הַנְּטָפוֹת ("the pendants"), which were probably ornaments worn, suspended by a band, on the forehead.<sup>3</sup> Not to mention any other of the various ornaments referred to in this passage, it may be pointed out that there was originally no distinction between ornaments and amulets among all Semites; even in the Targums we find the "ear-rings" mentioned in Genesis xxxv. 4, spoken of as *Kedashaja*, "sanctuaries," i.e. sacrosanct.<sup>4</sup> The reason for this was that, owing to the belief in the ubiquity of demons, it became necessary always to wear a kind of safe-guarding armour, in the shape of amulets and the like; later on these amulets became ornaments, but they continued to serve the same purpose. It will be interesting to give one or two details regarding the Arab use of amulets, for it will illustrate the Hebrew use. There were certain things for which demons had a great horror (so the Arabs believed, and the belief exists still), and if these were worn one might be quite safe from demon

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the Syriac ܡܠܝܫܐ and its derivatives, Brockelmann, *Lex. Syr.* s.v.

<sup>2</sup> The Aramaic equivalent is ܡܘܬܦܬܐ, cf. the ܡܘܬܦܝܬ ("frontlets") of Exod. xiii. 19, which will be referred to below.

<sup>3</sup> See Wellh. 165 f.

<sup>4</sup> Riehm, *H.B.A.* i. 60.

onslaughts. One of the most important of these was the bone, or part of one, of a hare ;<sup>1</sup> if this is worn, neither *Ginn*, nor house-demon, nor *Satan*, nor *Ghul*, nor any other class of demon will dare to molest the wearer ; the bone of a hare will moreover extinguish the fire of the fever-demon. The evil eye, called the "look of the *Ginn*," is a constant danger which must always be guarded against, for if the "look" penetrates the eye of anyone, the result will be a certain influence of the demon over such person, if not something worse, possession.<sup>2</sup> Anything, therefore, that tends to attract the "look" of the demon, and thus draw it away from the eye of a person, is good ; therefore precious stones are called "holy stones" by the Hebrews, and ear-rings are called "sanctuaries" by the Aramaeans.<sup>3</sup> In order to protect horses from the evil eye the Arabs hung little discs of gold and silver on their necks, camels were ornamented with gay-coloured cloths with the like purpose, or else strings of little pieces of metal were hung on them ; these made a jingling sound as soon as the animals moved, and this noise was believed to frighten away demons. Bells on horses no doubt served the same purpose, see Zechariah xiv. 20. A remnant of the same custom is often to be seen at the present day in the shape of necklets of brass discs on horses. It is possible that the "golden bells" attached to the High-priest's ephod were worn with the like object (Exod. xxviii. 33, 34). Other amulets were worn in the shape of necklaces, rings, bracelets, anklets, girdles, and especially knotted things ;<sup>4</sup> the significance of these latter

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the writer's art. *Why was the hare considered "unclean" among the Israelites*, in *The Churchman*, December, 1903, p. 150.

<sup>2</sup> One may recall the widespread belief that the spirit of a man may depart through his eyes instead of through his nose ; this would be bad (the reason was connected with the action of demons), hence the custom of "closing the eyes" of the dead, cf. Gen. xlv. 4.

<sup>3</sup> Wellh. 165. Riehm, *H.B.A.*, i. 292 f.

<sup>4</sup> Wellh. 165, 166. For Babylonian analogies see Jastrow, *op. cit.* chap. xvi. etc.

will at once be seen in view of what has already been said on the subject.

Another class of amulets, though not referred to in the prophetic books, deserves a passing notice. In Deuteronomy xxii. 12 we read of the **נָדִילִים** ("twisted cords") which were to be attached to the "vesture wherewith thou coverest thyself"; this commandment is explained in Numbers xv. 39, 40 (38-39 in Hebr.), where it says that these "twisted cords" were to be "for a fringe" (**לְצִיצִית**).<sup>1</sup> There can be little doubt that we have here a species of knotted cord which was used as a charm, or amulet, against demons; the wearing of them was probably an ancient custom which was adopted in later times by the ecclesiastical authorities for the purpose, as it is said, of "looking upon," in order to "remember all the commandments of the Lord to do them"; it is not easy to see the connexion here, but if the **נָדִילִים** were originally charms, borrowed from some foreign source, one can understand the reason for adapting them to Jahwe-worship. A charm of somewhat similar character would be the "cord" (**פֶּתִיל**) of Judah, mentioned in Genesis xxxviii. 18, 25.

Again, in Deuteronomy vi. 8, xi. 18, and elsewhere, we read of "frontlets" (**טַטְּפֹת**) to be worn "between the eyes," as well as something of the same kind to be worn upon the hand; these are the *Tephillin* or "Phylacteries" of later times, and their Greek name *φυλακτήριον* (see Matt. xxiii. 5) is sufficient to show that they were worn as "guards" against the attacks of demons.<sup>2</sup>

Lastly, the custom of writing upon the door-posts of houses the commandments of the Lord, in accordance with Deuteronomy vi. 9, xi. 20, constituted another safeguard against

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Matt. ix. 20, xiv. 36, xxiii. 5.

<sup>2</sup> According to the Targum, Saul's bracelet (2 Sam. i. 10) was a phylactery.

the approach of demons. This custom was also prevalent among the ancient Egyptians; the Mohammedans, too, inscribe verses from the *Koran* on their doors. Modern Jews, of the orthodox type, still use the *Mezuzah* ("Door-post Symbol"), which consists of a metal, glass or wooden tube fixed on to the doors of rooms; the tube is hollow, and contains a piece of parchment on which are written the first two paragraphs of the *Shema*' (Deut. vi. 4-9, xi. 13-21). If this custom was not taken from the Babylonians, they at least had one of an absolutely similar character; for, in order to guard themselves against demons and witches (who, as we have seen, were believed to be the incarnations of demons), they hung on the outside of their houses and on doors little plates with extracts from religious texts inscribed upon them.<sup>1</sup>

Space forbids us to deal with the connexion between demons and forbidden foods; for the same reason it is impossible to show how a number of mourning customs are to be explained by a belief in the presence of demons wherever there was a dead body; but sufficient has, it is hoped, been said to show that Old Testament Demonology is a far larger subject than would appear at first sight to be the case.

In a concluding article we shall hope to deal with Psalm xci.

W. O. E. OESTERLEY.

### THE ASSUAN ARAMAIC PAPYRI.

By the munificence and enterprise of Mr. Robert Mond, Honorary Secretary of the Davy-Faraday Research Laboratory of the Royal Institution, these priceless memorials of the past have been rescued from the rapacity of the dealer and private collector, and made available for science.

<sup>1</sup> Jastrow, i. 285. Cf. King in the *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, xi. 50-62.

Found accidentally by some workmen, they were secured just in time for the Cairo Museum, the Bodleian Library and the Berlin Museum. They have lately been published in superb form at Mr. Mond's expense by Professor Sayce, assisted by Mr. A. E. Cowley, with notes on the Egyptian names by Professor Spiegelberg, and an extensive Bibliography of the Egyptian Aramaic literature by Seymour de Ricci. Most scholars will be content to envy the completeness of the work which has left them so little to criticize. It is a significant feature that Professor Nöldeke is unsparing in his praise of translation, notes and the whole production.

The texts are those of a number of conveyances and legal documents relating to the transfer of property between the members of a Jewish settlement and their neighbours in Assuan and Elephantine, the twin fortresses which guarded Egypt against the Soudanese tribes. The population of these towns was extraordinarily composite. Egyptians, Persians and Babylonians appear beside a large number of Jews and Aramaeans. The documents extend over sixty years, from B.C. 471 to B.C. 411, from Xerxes to Darius Nothus. They constitute the largest connected body of early Aramaic yet available, and the gain to lexicography, grammar and the history of institutions is inestimable.

We know that early in the sixth century B.C. a number of Jews fled to Egypt, carrying with them the prophet Jeremiah: possibly thinking he would be an acceptable sacrifice to the Egyptian monarch as he had been in favour with the Babylonians. Whether the Jews of Assuan were the direct descendants of this migration, or of some later transportation, we cannot say. At any rate the refuge in Egypt did not avail long; for Egypt, as well as Babylonia, fell under Persian conquests. Babylonians



served in the Persian forces and the Persian rule was after all an extension of Babylonian power and civilization by new and more vigorous hands.

The great interest for us lies in the Jewish community. They had not apostasized from the faith of their forefathers, but they had not the same view of that faith as the prophets and historians of the Old Testament would have us believe to be orthodox. At a time when Ezra and Nehemiah were returning to inaugurate the era of Judaism as we know and understand it, these Jews, in Pathros, where Jeremiah had prophesied, worshipped Jehovah, calling him Yahu openly and without scruple. They thought it no wrong to build him a shrine on the king's way in Assuan, and they swore by his name in courts of law as freely as they did by that of the Egyptian gods when necessary to satisfy their neighbours. The Persian conquest had imposed no new religious ideas here at any rate, and it appears that the doctrine of worship at Jerusalem alone was unknown to the Jews of Assuan. There is no synagogue. Their attitude is that which later led to the temple of Onias at Heliopolis, and the whole religious atmosphere of the papyri is one more argument that the religion of the people in Judea was not quite what the orthodox party would have desired.

The thoroughly Jewish character of the community is strikingly attested by the names its members bore. The divine name rarely occurs at the beginning of a compound, only in Jeho-adar and Jah-hadari, but is frequent at the end of names in the familiar Biblical form *-iah*. Many of these names are borne by more than one person. Thus Ananiah at least twice, Azariah twice, Ba'adiah, Berechiah, Gedaliah, Gemariah twice, Hodaviah, Hoshaiiah twice, Isaiah, Jezaniah three times, Malchiah twice at least, Me'oziah twice, Mibhtahiah, Pelaliah, Pelatiah,

Qoniah, Reuiah, Uriah, Jedoniah six times, Zechariah three times, Zephaniah, are mostly well known Biblical names. They stamp the community as essentially Jewish.

Such names as Ahio twice, Ater, Ethan, Haggai, Hanan, Hosea six times, Menahem five times, Meshullam five times, Nathan six times, Shallum three times, Shalom, Shelomim, Zaccur five times, Zadok, are Biblical for the most part, and their owners were by parentage or relation evidently Jews. What is very remarkable among these Jewish names is the complete absence of compounds of El. It is equally interesting to find among the Jewish names of Assuan not a few of the most suspected forms in the Bible. The old Massoretes must chuckle in their graves. Yet these Jews were writing, if not speaking, Aramaic; no longer Hebrew, though a few Hebraisms are detected by scholars. The <sup>Heb.</sup> Aramaic language for this period is too little known, however, for us to be sure that it did not possess many words not now found in Biblical Aramaic.

Persian names are Artabanos, Artaphernes, Artaxerxes (the monarch), Arusathmar (?), Aryishâ, Athropadan, Bagdates, Damidata, Dargman (?), Darius (the king), Haûmadâta, Ostanès, Phrataphernes, Satibarzanes, Warizath, Widrang, Xerxes (the king). For the most part these appear to be officials, probably concerned with military or fiscal administration of the empire. We look in vain in the glossary for Persian words introduced by the conquest into Aramaean daily life. Only one or two are doubtfully assigned by Mr. Cowley to a Persian origin, and they may turn out to be Babylonian or possibly misreadings of the text.

Egyptian names are few; As-Hor (but compare the Ashur of 1 Chronicles ii. 24, iv. 5, and compounds of Hur in Assyrian and Babylonian names), Espemet, Khnum,

Pahi, Peft-ônît, Peti-khnum, Petisis, Petosiris, Pî, Teos, Thebo (?). It is clear that the Jews in Assuan spoke Aramaic without any admixture of Egyptian words. They could hardly have learnt that tongue in Egypt, though it was the official language of their Persian masters. The inference is that they came into Egypt speaking it. There is nothing remarkable in this, as Aramaic appears to have been the colloquial tongue throughout the late Assyrian empire and Babylonia before the captivity.

Assyrian, or rather Babylonian names, 'Athar-ili, 'Athar-shuri (probably Syrian names; see my *Harran Census*), Ben-Tirash (Elamite?), Hadad-nûrî, Ibni-Marduk, Iddin-Nabû, Lîlû, Lûhî, Mannu-kî, Marduk (?), Nabû-kuduri, Nabû-lî, Nabû-shum-ishkun, Nabû-tukulti, Nabû-zîr-ibni Nabû-zar-adan, Paltu, Sin-kashid, and possibly a few others, are very startling to find far away at the extreme south of Egypt. What did such persons there in Assuan? Were they officials sent from Babylonia by their Persian masters?

Names like Gadol five times, Hanûl (?), Mahaseh, Mahseiah twice, Nebo-nathan, Nebo-re'î twice, Penuliah twice, Yigdal, Yislah and a few others may be Aramaic purely; but some of them have marked similarities to Biblical names, though not actually to be found as such. We have no right to assume that the Bible contains all the names that were borne by Israelites either before or after the captivity. The evidently Jewish names are those known to us for the later times of Ezra and Nehemiah, and there are none of the characteristic names of the Maccabæan age, Johanan or Simeon or Joshua; on the other hand the names of the patriarchs, Abraham, Israel, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, etc., are as entirely absent as if these Jews had no knowledge of such ancestry.

Now, when we examine the vocabulary we are struck

at once with the Babylonian complexion of it. This may be deceptive; for the Babylonian literature is now so extensive and the vocabulary so large that it may well contain many words originally Aramaic: especially as it has hitherto been known chiefly for the periods after the Aramaeans were in touch with Assyria or Babylonia. We are, however, becoming increasingly acquainted with the earlier Babylonian of the First Dynasty, and finding it markedly West Semitic or "Amorite." Hence we may regard the presence of many words in Aramaic as due to Aramaean indebtedness to Babylonia after their settlement in Upper Mesopotamia. Names are often borrowed with things, and it is always precarious to argue much influence from the mere lexicon. It is, however, pleasing to Assyriologists to note the increasing willingness of Semitic scholars to acknowledge the influence of Babylonian or Assyrian civilization in the Western Oriental world.

Much more significant is the form in which these legal documents are drawn up. They quote Assyrian formulae in a very remarkable way. As in many ways the Persians took over the Babylonian civilization and impressed it on their empire one might expect that the Babylonian legal forms would serve as a model for Aramaic-speaking people. We know the forms current in Babylonia under Artaxerxes from the *Business Documents of Murashû Sons*, published by Dr. A. T. Clay, and we can trace them back for centuries in Babylonia. But the Jews at Assuan did not use them. They used the forms current in Assyria in the seventh century B.C., which themselves go back to the Babylonia of the Hammurabi period. Unless the Persians had learned them from Assyria long before the time of Cyrus we cannot see how they could have taught them to the Jews of Assuan. They taught those Jews



little of their own. The Babylonians present in Assuan would surely have taught them the forms then current in Babylonia. Assyrians, if such they were, might have preserved remembrances of bygone custom. Aramaeans might have acquired them in the past from Assyria; but at any rate they had preserved them intact with singular fidelity. It is more likely that the compatriots of Jeremiah brought these elements of Assyrian legal procedure into Egypt with them. Then it is obvious to conclude that the Jews in Palestine and even Judea before the captivity were accustomed to use the legal formulae of Assyria. We have long been aware that the Jewish law forms in the Talmud are closely related to those of Babylonia, there was nothing in them repugnant to the religious consciousness of the people. This is, however, a far more significant conclusion. If legal forms, how much else? They called their temple of Jehovah by no Hebrew, Aramaic, Egyptian or Persian name, but plain Assyrian, as Nöldeke has pointed out.

It must be insisted upon that at present we have no full proof that such legal forms are actually due to the impress of Assyria upon Judea before the captivity, only a strong probability, which will not convince all. It is noteworthy, however, that the Assuan papyri give transliterations of the Assyrian forms, not translations into Aramaic. They quote them as lawyers now quote tags of Latin. They had words of their own that would form exact translations, but they transfer the very words. This is far more significant of "borrowing" than any amount of general similarity of procedure, which might arise from the tendency of men everywhere under the same necessities to hit upon the same devices. What is now needed is a study of other Aramaic legal documents, whether from Egypt or elsewhere, to see whether this copying of Assyrian



legal forms was confined to the Jews of Assuan. Until proof arrives that it was not so confined, the above theory holds the field that they brought these forms from Judea, and that therefore Judea before the captivity was "permeated" as far as its lawyers were concerned, at least, by Assyrian culture. Whether this was absorbed during the Assyrian conquests of the seventh century, or whether it along with Assyrian culture itself goes back to the Babylonia of the First Dynasty, must depend upon other evidence. In the latter case we should have the pre-Israelite Canaanites as the intermediaries. As it stands, there is food for thought and much need for further research.

C. H. W. JOHNS.

*THE DIVINE CHILD IN VIRGIL :*

*A SEQUEL TO PROFESSOR MAYOR'S STUDY.*

PROFESSOR J. B. MAYOR has treated afresh the interesting and oft-discussed problem of the Fourth Eclogue of Virgil in a recent number of this magazine ;<sup>1</sup> and on the whole the present writer is in agreement with the general results of the treatment. In particular, it seems impossible to understand the Fourth Eclogue without the supposition that Virgil had experienced a certain influence from Hebrew poetry ; and in this present article other reasons for this opinion besides those mentioned by Professor Mayor will be mentioned.

But, whereas Professor Mayor is inclined to reject the supposition that this influence came direct to Virgil from the works of Isaiah as translated (we must of course understand a Greek, not a Latin, translation), and argues that the Roman poet knew no more of the Hebrew poet than what filtered through the poor medium of the Sibylline Books, I confess that this appears to me an inadequate

<sup>1</sup> EXPOSITOR, April, 1907.

hypothesis, and that there seems no difficulty to prevent us from believing Virgil to have been acquainted with a Greek translation of Isaiah. It is mentioned by ancient authorities that he had read widely in remote regions of philosophy ; and as Isaiah had certainly been translated into Greek, and as the lofty religious thought of the Jews had certainly exercised a strong influence over many Roman minds and over the popular imagination of the ancient Roman world, it seems quite a fair supposition that he had become acquainted with Isaiah in Greek. I shall not, however, enter into this question in detail, except to remark that the influence on Virgil's metre in this poem (which will be pointed out in the sequel) seems inconsistent with the idea that he was indebted to the Sibylline verses alone. I am not concerned to deny or to affirm anything about his having seen the Sibylline poems ; but it seems quite safe to assert, in the first place, that no such commonplace lines as make up those poems could have any influence on Virgil's metrical form—one might as soon imagine that Shelley was influenced in his metrical form by Shadwell or Pye—and, in the second place, that only the original expression of the ideas in the suitable metrical form by a great poet could have determined Virgil to make this unique experiment in Latin metre—an experiment which he never repeated—or could have inspired him to express the anticipations of the champions of the New Empire in so Hebraic and un-Roman a form.

We may assume all that Professor Mayor has so well said about the relation of Virgil's details and words to Isaiah. I shall add some remarks on the Hebrew and non-Roman character of the main subject and of the metre, and on the form in which Virgil develops an idea which was floating before the minds of many in Italy at the time. To show how naturally our results rise from the facts, I shall use the

statement which I made on the subject many years ago to a meeting of the Franco-Scottish Society, only slightly modifying the form, but leaving the thoughts unchanged.

There are two facts which determine the evolution of this ideal picture in Virgil's poem. Virgil is perfectly sure that the glorified and idealized Italy of his vision is being realized in their own time and before their own eyes, and he connects that realization with a new-born child. These are two ideas to which no real parallel can be found in preceding Greek or Roman literature. The Better Age had been conceived by the Greeks as lying in the past, and the world's history as a progress towards decay. Even where a cycle of ages was spoken of by the Greek philosophers, it was taken rather as a proof that no good thing could last, than as an encouragement to look forward to a better future. Moreover Virgil's new age, though spoken of in his opening lines as a part of a recurring cycle, is not pictured before his view as evanescent; it is coming, but its end is not seen and not thought of by him.

How does Virgil arrive at his firm conviction that the best is last, and that the best is surely coming, nay that it now is? We cannot regard it as arising entirely from his own inspiration, springing mature and full-grown, like Athena from the head of Zeus. Rather we must agree with Professor Mayor that we ought to trace the stages in its development to the perfect form which it has in this poem.

Again, the association of a young child with this coming age is something entirely alien to Greek and Roman thought. It springs from a sense of a divine purpose, developing in the growth of the race and working itself out in the life of other new generations, a thought not in itself foreign to the philosophical speculation of Greece, but developed here in a form so unusual that it imperatively demands

our recognition and explanation. It was too delicate for the philosophers, though one finds it to a certain degree in the poets. Nowhere can we find any previous philosophy or religion that had grasped the thought firmly and unhesitatingly, except among the Hebrew race. To the Hebrew prophets, and to them alone, the Better Age lay always in the future :—

The best is yet to be,  
The last of life, for which the first was made.

The Hebrews always recognized that the divine purpose reserved for them a future better than the past, and they alone associated the coming of the Better Age with the birth of a child. We must, I think, look to the East and to Hebrew poetry for the germ from which Virgil's poem developed, though in the process of development nourishment from many other sides determined its growth and affected its character.

Looking at the poem from another point of view, we recognize that it is a metrical experiment, which Virgil tried in this one case and never repeated. Its metrical character seemed to him appropriate to his treatment of this one subject ; but he found no other subject which it suited, and he considered that the true development of the heroic verse lay in another direction.

Landor, in his criticisms on Catullus's twelfth ode, has the following remarks on the metrical character of this Eclogue. "The worst, but most admired, of Virgil's Eclogues, was composed to celebrate the birth of Pollio's son in his consulate. In this Eclogue, and in this alone, his versification fails him utterly. The lines afford one another no support. For instance this sequence (lines 4-6):—

Ultima Cumæi venit jam carminis ætas.  
Magnus ab integro sæclorum nascitur ordo.  
Jam redit et Virgo, redeunt Saturnia regna.

Toss them in a bag and throw them out, and they will fall as rightly in one place as another. Any one of them may come first ; any one of them come last ; any one of them may come immediately ; better that any one should never come at all." But in this criticism (apart from the fact that the force of lines 4-6 would suffer seriously if they were transposed, though grammar and metre might be uninjured), Landor has not observed that Virgil is deliberately trying an experiment in order to obtain a special effect. We do not maintain that the ruling metrical form would be unsuitable for ordinary Latin use, but its employment in this case is obviously intentional, and dictated by the subject ; it is no case of accidental failure in versification.

The two most distinguishing and salient metrical characteristics of this Eclogue are, first, that the stops coincide more regularly with the ends of lines than in any other passage of Virgil, so that to a large extent each single verse gives a distinct sense ; and, secondly, that in a number of cases the second half of the line repeats with slight variation the meaning of the first half, or, when the sense is enclosed in two hexameters, the second repeats the meaning of the first. These characteristics are unlike any previous treatment of the hexameter. As to the first, it is true that in the earliest stages of Virgil's metre the stops are placed at the ends of lines to a much greater extent than in its later stages. But there is a general agreement among Latin scholars that the fourth Eclogue is not the earliest ; and even compared with the earliest, its metre is seen to be something peculiar and apart.

These characteristics are distinctly those of Hebrew poetry ; and it appears to me that the metrical treatment of this Eclogue can hardly be explained except as an experiment made in imitation of the same original, from which



sprang the central conception of the Better Age surely approaching, and inaugurated by the birth of a child. Virgil found the idea and the metrical form together ; that is to say, he did not gather the idea from a secondary source, but had read it (in translation) as expressed by a great writer, whose poetic form dominated his mind for the moment. Only a writer of the loftiest poetic power could have so affected the mind of Virgil. We notice, too, that the peculiar metrical form is most marked where the expression approaches the prophetic type, while in the descriptive parts the metre is closer to the form common in the Eclogues.

That such an origin for Virgil's idea is possible, will be doubted by no one who takes properly into account both the width of his reading, and the influence which the strange and unique character of the Jewish nation and religion (and here the religion made and was the nation) already had exerted and was exerting on the Græco-Roman world. That is a subject over which there hangs, and must always hang, a thick veil ; but enough is known to give us increasing certainty, as time goes on, that the fascination which Judaism exerted on a certain class of minds was very strong, and its influence on Roman society far greater than is apparent in the superficial view which alone is permitted us in the dearth of authorities.

Finally, the often quoted analogies with several passages of the prophet Isaiah afford some indication as to the identity of the great poet whose words, either in a Greek translation or in extracts, had come before Virgil, and influenced the development of his thought. It is true that there are numerous points in this Eclogue which go back to Greek models. The ideas taken up from Virgil from a Semitic source are developed in a mind rich with Hellenic knowledge and strong with a vigorous Italian life. Virgil

is never a mere imitator except in his most juvenile work ; he reforms and transforms everything that he has learned from his great instructors. It is an Italian idyll that he has given us, not a mere transplantation of a foreign idea, or of any number of foreign ideas.

The aim of this paper is rather to add to what Professor Mayor has said than to differ from him. The process of adding, however, may sometimes change the point of view, though it does not really express any essential difference of opinion, but merely builds on what he has said already very well. Thus, though I think that mere knowledge of Sibylline verses is not sufficient to explain the origin of the Fourth Eclogue, I should entirely agree in thinking that most probably Virgil was acquainted with those verses. In all that Professor Mayor has said on this curious subject I must be taken as agreeing cordially ; and I quite admit that Virgil may have ideas from them and have been directed in his reading by them ; but I cannot consider that they are the sole or the chief foundation of the Fourth Eclogue.

Professor Mayor sees quite clearly and rightly that the Fourth Eclogue must be studied as simply one moment in the long evolution of pagan thought. He sees that ancient thought and philosophy always turned on the idea of a steady degeneration in human life and in the history of the world. Even where there was among the ancients some conception of a cycle in mundane affairs, the cycle consisted of a degeneration culminating in total destruction, following by a fresh beginning on a better scale. This is not really anything more than a degeneration and a recreation by divine power. We have here nothing in any degree corresponding to the modern idea of development and growth and steady improvement.

Now the modern theory of human history, and especially of the history of religion, is that it is a continuous evolution

from the savage state to the civilized, from cruelty to kindness, from ignorance to knowledge. Is the modern theory based on a true assumption, or on a false one? It is certainly based on a very big assumption; and I cannot see that any real attempt is ever made to establish the assumption on a firm basis. We are now all devotees of the theory of evolution; it is no longer to us a theory, it has become the foundation and guiding principle of all our thought. We must find some principle of development everywhere and in all things; and we arrange our view of history accordingly. But this is all very good, if we get hold of the right principle of development in history: then it is a truly scientific process that we are following. But what if we have got hold of a false principle? Then our whole procedure is pseudo-scientific, and only leads further and further away from the truth.

The ancient view was diametrically the opposite of the modern. To the ancient all history was a progress towards decay, a degeneration from good to bad. We are too apt to set aside this old view without a thought as pure prejudice and as the ancient fashion; all people used to think so. We remember the usual tendency of old persons to moralize on the better state of the world in their youth, and on the decay of good conduct and good manners. But is that all that lies underneath the ancient view? When we remember the practical universality of that view, and the way in which it colours all ancient literature, I cannot think that this is a sufficient explanation of the phenomenon. It was not merely the conscious expression of philosophers or of popular moralists: it was the deep, almost unconscious, hardly articulate view of all men. It caused that undertone of sadness which one hears in all Greek and Roman poetry, a certain note of hopelessness which makes itself felt everywhere. Every person who has to lecture on ancient poetry,

and especially Roman poetry, to young students must often call their attention to this deep-seated feeling. It is the same that every one who lives in Constantinople at the present day becomes conscious of. It arises from the inevitable perception that one is in an atmosphere of decay, degeneration, degradation, and that there is no improvement to be hoped for. The contemplation of and living among the degenerate aspects of modern civilization, as seen in great cities, produces something of the same feeling ; but the sense of hopelessness is here not so strong ; the evil and the decay are equally conspicuous, but there is also a correcting impression of error that may be rectified and fault that must be struggled against.

But that hopelessness was the almost universal feeling in the world of Greek and Roman paganism. To regard it as mere popular fallacy, and lightly to set it aside as of no account, as the modern writers generally do, is neither scientific nor justifiable. That the professional philosophers should have erred is not impossible or even improbable ; but the universal deep-lying feeling of the people, underlying all their poetry and guiding their half-articulate expression of thought, cannot be wrong, and must be accounted for. To one who looks at ancient history in the Mediterranean lands it must seem to rise from a perception of the truth and the facts.

It was patent to every observer in late Greek and Roman times that the history of the Mediterranean lands had on the whole been a process of degeneration and decay ; and as we now look back over that history we must come to the same opinion. In the sphere of agriculture we can trace in outline the peaceful conquest in remote time of a naturally rocky and barren land for the use of man. We can recover through recent research some faint idea of the way in which prosperity, civilization and well-being in the Mediterranean



lands were built up in early time—of the knowledge, accumulated experience, wisdom and forethought which were applied in order to lay the foundations of that prosperity—of the order, peace, settled government and security of property which made that slow, laborious process possible. Of this subject the present writer has published a brief study in the *Contemporary Review*, December, 1906, "The Peasant God."

And to take just one example in the intellectual sphere, we now know that the art of writing was well known and familiarly practised at a very early time in the Mediterranean world (especially the East Mediterranean); and that practical administration presupposed the existence of that knowledge and familiar use of writing. The processes of government and law were based on the principle that everything must be written down at the moment, e.g. that all sales and conveyance of important property must be registered in writing. But this inestimably important fact we have learned only in quite recent times from the discovery of the writings themselves: a process of discovery in which this University has played the leading part. We know that people wrote at a very early time, because we have found the documents which they wrote—on stone, on bronze, on pottery, partly incised or in relief, partly in ink. The use of ink is an extremely important fact, because ink was never invented for use on materials of that kind; it was invented for the purpose of writing on more perishable materials, such as paper or skins or parchment; ink-written pottery implies the previous and contemporary use of those less durable materials.<sup>1</sup> But Egypt is the only country which is dry enough to preserve such perishable substances; and the wider knowledge and use of ink furnishes the proof that similar perishable materials for writing were used in other countries besides Egypt.

In this way we are beginning to elaborate an outline of

<sup>1</sup> See *The Letters to the Seven Churches*, chap. i.



the ancient Mediterranean civilization, and to trace the steps of its history and its gradual decay.

Its decay arose from inner weakness ; and the inroads of eastern barbarians, which finally destroyed it, became dangerous only when its weakness increased. There is always going on the same historic conflict between civilization and barbarism ; and so long as civilization is true to itself, healthy in its construction, or, as Paul would say, so long as it listens to God, it can resist and overcome the forces of barbarism. Paul, in his brief way, sums up the stages of decay as the stages in the degeneration of human sympathy with and knowledge of the Divine nature, i.e. in the growth of idolatry. We may work them out in more detail, and show the precise changes in circumstance and outward form by which the decay proceeded. We may trace how the inner weakness showed itself first in one region, then in another. We may see that Sicily and Greece were already a prey to ruin, when some other parts of the Mediterranean world were still growing and healthy. We can delight ourselves with the picture which Statius draws, as late as A.D. 92, of the improvement effected by wisely planned operations on the bare rocky headland of Surrentum (Sorrento), on the southern horn of the Gulf of Naples, where the barren expanse of stone was subdued to the use of man and became docile to his hand, where the projecting rocks were cut down to the level, and the soil brought and laid down, so that groves of trees could grow, where no soil, but only bare stone, formerly was seen ; where a marvel greater than the fables of Orpheus and of Amphion was taking place before the sight of living men, under the orders of a wise owner, who made the rocks move and the tall forests follow after him. In that picture you have an account which may be applied all round the Mediterranean Sea in ancient times, and which still applies to a few regions like Malta (naturally

a bare rock, where almost all the soil has been introduced by man).

Not merely was this idea of a continuous degeneration of the Mediterranean world practically universal in Greek and Roman thought, it is also a fundamental principle in the view of the Apostle Paul. There was only this one mighty difference: the pagan opinion was hopeless and despairing—with one remarkable exception, which we must proceed to study in its character and extent—whereas Paul made this opinion the foundation on which to base his argument that all nature and all men were eagerly looking for a Saviour from this impending ruin and death, and that the Saviour was before them, and offered to them, if they would only recognize and believe.

In this way Paul presented his doctrine to the men of the Graeco-Roman world as the completion and culmination of their own philosophy and their own experience. He did not denounce their philosophical or religious views as wholly wrong. He maintained that in their original opinions there was contained some true knowledge about the nature of God and about His relation to mankind; but that there had been a degeneration from this fair beginning. The reason of the degeneration lay in the growth of false ideas about the nature of God, i.e., in idolatry. Yet man, as Paul says, never becomes so wholly corrupt that it is impossible for him to recover his lost advantages and return to the truth. Some of the Gentiles, knowing not the higher truth of the Law as revealed to the Jews, are a Law unto themselves; but in most of them this instinct towards the truth has become so obscured by wrong-doing that they have lost all consciousness of it, and cannot and will not hear the voice of God in their hearts. Still in the most utterly vitiated pagan man there remains a sense of misconduct, a feeling of pain, and a consciousness that he is wrong. This remnant of the original power of apprehending the Divine truth is

traceable in the sorrow and the pain and regret from which no man is free entirely. So long as this pain lasts, hope exists that the man may return to God. The pain is an accompaniment of the coming birth of higher ideas, of regeneration and redemption.

This Pauline view, as stated in Romans i. 19 ff., ii. 14 f., viii. 19 ff., has been described more fully in the *EXPOSITOR*, April, 1906, p. 374 ff.

The Pauline theory of degeneration is simply the application to human history of the ultimate fact from which he begins, and on which his whole mind and being rests—his consciousness that the Divine alone is real, and that all else is mere error and false appearance. From this initial fact it follows that a serious error as to the nature of God distorts and vitiates the nature of man. If the error goes on increasing and deepening, the distortion and vitiation of man's nature becomes worse and worse : in other words, the history of man and of society, in a state of idolatry and thorough misconception of the Divine nature, must be a process of steady, continuous degeneration. There can be no standing still in human life. The mind which sees God and hears His voice must move towards Him, and comprehend His nature better and better. The mind which is closed against the Divine voice is necessarily involved in a process of hardening, of increasing blindness, and of progressive degradation.

Thus the universal pagan view about the history of the Mediterranean lands seemed to Paul merely the correct perception of the facts of life, a proof of the original affinity to truth and the Divine in human nature ; and the tone of melancholy in pagan literature was to him a symptom of the pain which afforded some hope that the Graeco-Roman world might awaken to the consciousness and true perception of God.

The degeneration of the pagan world had worked itself out by certain stages, which it is the business of the historian

to trace in detail. Paul's business was only to insist on the fact of this degeneration, to prove it from the universal consciousness of men, to insist on the one and only possible remedy, and to point out that this remedy was open and ready and certain for the whole world.

Now, as we have said, there was one exception to this universal hopelessness in the pagan world ; and this exception was born out of the most desperate straits to which the Mediterranean world had yet been reduced, viz., the Civil Wars of Italy, and the apparently imminent ruin of the one great remaining power of order in the Mediterranean. The terrible suffering entailed by those wars and disorder proved, just as the Pauline view declared, the birth-pangs of a new hope. It was in this situation that the Fourth Eclogue sprang into being, the announcement by a great poet of the hope which was coming into being in the minds of many at this crisis. The poem had its origin in an almost accidental occasion of literary history, at which we must for a moment glance.

W. M. RAMSAY.

(To be continued.)

#### NOTES ON RECENT NEW TESTAMENT STUDY.

IN a recent monograph on the apostolic decree of Acts xv. (*Das Aposteldecret nach seiner ausserkanonischen Text-gestalt*), issued in the *Texte und Untersuchungen* (Leipzig, 1905), Gotthold Resch pleads for the revolutionary hypothesis that the original form of Acts xv. 28 f., substantially preserved in the Western text, ran thus : ἔδοξεν γὰρ τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι καὶ ἡμῖν μηδὲν πλέον ἐπιτίθесθαι ὑμῖν βάρος πλὴν τούτων τῶν ἐπάναγκες· ἀπέχεσθαι εἰδωλοθύτων καὶ αἵματος καὶ πορνείας καὶ ὅσα μὴ θέλετε ἑαυτοῖς γίνεσθαι ἐτέρῳ μὴ ποιεῖν· ἀφ' ὧν διατηροῦντες ἑαυτοὺς εὖ πράξατε φερόμενοι ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι ἔρρωσθε. In defence of this view (pp. 68 f.), he has to meet the objection that the Western text seems merely to be a later attempt, made during the second



century, to smooth away the difficulties of the ceremonial features in the canonical text by introducing the golden rule. His answer is that the Western text, with its moral emphasis, was by no means an obvious commonplace at the time of the apostolic council. The Jews were in danger, as we see from Matthew xv. 3, 6, of exaggerating the ceremonial precepts of the Law to the detriment of the ethical. Hence the assertion of the golden rule as a *sine quâ non* was far from being a platitude; it was, on the contrary, both timely and epoch-making.

A further peculiarity of this view is its omission of *πνικτόν*, or strangled meat, from the prohibitions of the decree (pp. 23 f.). Resch holds that the Western text here is undoubtedly superior to the canonical, since the term is unknown to the Old Testament and the Talmud. No basis for the prohibition of "things strangled" can be found in Genesis ix. 4, which refers to the "*membrum animalis viventis*," or in Leviticus xvii. 13, 14, which alludes to a prohibition of blood, whereas *πνικτόν* is flesh. Till the fourth century A.D., Jewish tradition, Resch avers (citing a Jewish expert, Dr. Wiener, to this effect), never understood the passage from Leviticus as prohibiting the eating of *πνικτόν* as flesh; it was the Christians of that time who first outdid the Jews in legal strictness by extending the conception of *πνικτόν* to include the flesh. Nor in Leviticus xvii. 15, 16 can the canonical sense of *πνικτόν* be traced (cf. Deut. xiv. 21). The identification of the term in Acts xv. with *θνησιμαῖον καὶ θηριάλωτον* is pronounced an exegetical makeshift, as indeed Zeller saw many years ago. In short, "Jewish theology was ignorant of the term *πνικτόν*" in the canonical sense; as a matter of fact, *πνικτόν* was never included among the forbidden foods, and consequently it is extremely unlikely that it would be reckoned among them in the first century.

In a note contributed to Preuschen's *Zeitschrift* (1906,



254-256), Dr. Nestle discusses the same problem of the meaning of *πνικτόν*, noting, as Resch does, its absence from certain passages of the Clementine literature, and appealing for more information from experts upon the exact significance and use of the term. He too admits that the inclusion of the golden rule in the decree does not necessarily convert it into a general moral catechism, but may have had a bearing on the mutual relations of the Jewish and the Gentile Christians.

Dr. Alphons Steinmann, the Roman Catholic scholar, however, objects strongly to this view in his recent monograph on *Die Abfassungszeit des Galaterbriefes* (1906, pp. 70 f.). With Seeberg, he considers that Resch has failed to disprove the origin of *πνικτόν* in pre-Christian Judaism. The prohibition of it as a food would follow naturally, in his opinion, from Leviticus xvii., so that there is no reason to conjecture that the original ethical catechism of Acts xv. was changed into a list of prohibited foods by the subsequent introduction of *πνικτόν*. Similarly Rudolf Knopf, in his recent edition of Acts (in *die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, ii. p. 65), refuses to admit the originality of the Western form of the decree. Like several other critics, he considers the canonical form to be genuine, yet denies that it could have been promulgated at this period. It is not unhistorical, however; the author of Acts has simply ante-dated it. Probably it was drawn up and forwarded to Antioch after Paul had left that city; its occasion was certainly subsequent to Galatians ii. 11 f., which explains Paul's failure to mention it, and also accounts for the fact that his ignorance of its terms is assumed in Acts xxi. 25.

To return to Resch. In order to make out his case, he has to show that the three prohibitions of *εἰδωλόθυτα*, *πορνεία*, and *αἷμα* refer to serious moral offences. He does this in the following manner. *Εἰδωλόθυτα* (pp. 21 f.) denotes either a sacrifice to idols or the remainder of flesh

that had been thus sacrificed. In the latter sense, it meant food sold in the markets apart from any connexion with sacrificial worship. The two meanings are illustrated by 1 Corinthians x. 14–22, and 23–33 respectively. Now the canonical text of Acts xv. implies, by the insertion of *πνικτόν*, the second sense of the term *εἰδωλόθυτα*, although even Leviticus xvii., which is taken as the basis for such prohibitions, knows nothing whatever of a commandment to abstain from eating food of this nature at a private meal, whilst Paul distinctly asserts that such a practice is an *ἀδιάφορον*, instead of being *ἐπάναγκες*. Similarly in the Apocalypse (ii. 14, 20) to eat *εἰδωλόθυτα* means not to partake privately of food which had been offered for sale in the market as the remainder of sacrificial material, but to offer sacrifices to idols (pp. 35–37). In the light of contemporary usage, therefore, *εἰδωλόθυτα* in Acts xv. cannot denote anything but idolatry. The second item, *πορνεία*, is only strange when combined with prohibitions of food. In its original meaning of “fornication,” it was extremely apt, in view of the pagan excesses to which Gentile Christians had hitherto been accustomed (pp. 73, 74). Similarly with the prohibition of murder (*αἶμα*), which subsumes all the sins against the fifth commandment mentioned by Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount (p. 75). The substitution of *αἶμα* for *φόνος* is probably due to the influence of Leviticus xix. 16 f. And the golden rule which follows, in the Western text of the decree, expands and applies this prohibition of all unbrotherly conduct. The three sins thus banned are the three deadly sins of the early Church, as Tertullian, in the twelfth chapter of his treatise *de pudicitia*, expressly asserts. Corssen has made this a reason for doubting the originality of the Western text of the decree. The canonical form, he argues, was curtailed by Montanist influence, in order to convert it into a catechism against these three deadly sins. But (pp. 144 f.), as Resch points

out, the Montanists had not three but seven deadly sins, and it is highly improbable that even within Catholic circles such an abbreviation would have been possible. On the contrary, he believes that the rise of the canonical and secondary form of the decree can be accounted for, historically, by the influence of Clement of Alexandria and Origen, who are responsible for introducing *πνικτόν* into the scope of the decree and thereby altering its character. Their reason (pp. 151 f.) was the desire to safeguard their Christian contemporaries against idolatry, since, in the superstition of the day, the blood of beasts which had not been slain and drained of their blood, was a *τροφή* of daemons. To partake of it was to be defiled by them. Hence, "an attempt was made to find in the decree the sanction of that practice of abstinence from all sacrificial food, whether slain or strangled, which had grown up, independently of the decree, both in the East and in the West. Nor can it be denied that the very language of the decree gave some occasion for this interpretation. The term *ἀπέχεσθαι* itself might suggest the idea of abstinence from food . . . and *εἰδωλόθυτα* was still more liable to be misread." Had some equivalent expression like *εἰδωλολατρεία* been used for it, as *φεύγειν* for *ἀπέχεσθαι* (cf. 1 Cor. x. 14), or *φόνος* for *αἷμα*, such a reconstruction of the decree would have been impossible as arose about the year 190 A.D. in Alexandria and passed into the canonical text of the New Testament.

The origin of the whole letter (Acts xv. 23–29) is discussed afresh by Harnack in his monograph on *Lukas der Arzt* (1906, pp. 153 f.), who agrees with Weiss, as against Zahn, that it is composed by Luke. The style and vocabulary are examined, and the result is held to be that these verses do not represent some source, but that they were written, like the speeches in the Book of Acts, by Luke himself.

JAMES MOFFATT.

ERRATUM.—On page 313, 3 lines from bottom, for *ὁμογενής* read *μονογενής*.

## INDEX.

	PAGE
<b>Rev. Professor B. W. Bacon, D.D., LL.D.</b>	
Lucan <i>Versus</i> Johannine Chronology . . . . .	206
<b>Rev. Thomas Barns, M.A. †</b>	
The Number of the Beast: a Warning against Mithras Worship. . . . .	220
<b>Rev. Professor W. H. Bennett, D.D., Litt.D.</b>	
The Life of Christ according to St. Mark . . . . .	153
<b>Very Rev. J. H. Bernard, D.D., D.C.L.</b>	
The Magnificat . . . . .	193
The Connexion between the Fifth and Sixth Chapters of 1 Corinthians . . . . .	433
<b>Rev. Arthur Carr, M.A.</b>	
The Testimony of St. John to the Virgin Birth of Our Lord . . . . .	311
<b>Rev. Professor A. E. Garvie, M.A., D.D.</b>	
The Agony in the Garden . . . . .	159
The Desolation of the Cross . . . . .	507
<b>Rev. Professor A. R. Gordon, M.A.</b>	
Job . . . . .	185, 228
<b>Professor J. Rendel Harris, M.A., Litt.D.</b>	
Sons of Thunder . . . . .	146
Irenaeus on the Apostolical Preaching . . . . .	246
A Further Note on the Cretans . . . . .	332
A Speculation in Textual Criticism . . . . .	444
<b>J. H. A. Hart, M.A.</b>	
The Scribes of the Nazarenes:—	
2. The Gospel according to St. Luke and the Descent into Hades . . . . .	53
3. The Reed and the Courtier . . . . .	259

	PAGE
<b>Rev. Principal James Iverach, D.D.</b>	
Pantheism . . . . .	493
<b>Rev. C. H. W. Johns, M.A.</b>	
The Assuan Aramaic Papyri . . . . .	544
<b>E. E. Kellett, M.A.</b>	
Some Notes on Christian Dioscurism . . . . .	374
<b>Rev. Asad Mansur, of Nazareth.</b>	
The Site of Capernaum . . . . .	360
<b>Professor G. Currie Martin, M.A., B.D.</b>	
The Epistle of James as a Storehouse of the Sayings of Jesus . . . . .	174
<b>Rev. J. B. Mayor, Litt.D.</b>	
Virgil and Isaiah: an Inquiry into the Sources of the Fourth Eclogue of Virgil . . . . .	289
<b>Rev. James Moffatt, D.D.</b>	
Notes on Recent New Testament Study. . . . .	88, 478, 564
<b>Rev. W. O. E. Oesterley, B.D.</b>	
The Demonology of the Old Testament . . . . .	316
The Demonology of the Old Testament Illustrated from the Prophetical Writings . . . . .	527
<b>Rev. L. B. Radford, M.A.</b>	
Distinctions of External Function in the Holy Trinity . . . . .	468
<b>Professor Sir W. M. Ramsay, D.C.L., LL.D., D.D.</b>	
Pisidian Antioch . . . . .	72, 271, 338
Professor Harnack on Luke . . . . .	97
The Oldest Written Gospel . . . . .	410
The Divine Child in Virgil: a Sequel to Professor Mayor's Study . . . . .	551
<b>Rev. H. A. Redpath, M.A., Litt.D.</b>	
Christ, the Fulfilment of Prophecy . . . . .	1
<b>Rev. Professor W. Sanday, D.D., Litt.D.</b>	
St. Paul's Gospel: an Eirenicon . . . . .	385
<b>Rev. Professor C. Anderson Scott, M.A.</b>	
Dr. Swete's Edition of the Apocalypse . . . . .	38



# INDEX OF TEXTS

571

PAGE

Professor Alex. Souter, M.A., Litt.D.

The Commentary of Pelagius on the Epistles of St. Paul 467

Rev. Professor James Stalker, D.D.

Robert Rainy . . . . . 125

Rev. W. L. Walker.

Christ's Preaching of the Kingdom . . . . . 21

Rev. A. Westcott, M.A.

The Divisions of the First Epistle of St. John: a Correspondence between Drs. Westcott and Hort . . . 481

## INDEX OF TEXTS.

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
Gen. ii. 15 . . .	270	Isa. xxxv. 4 . . .	262	Mark i. 21 . . .	103
xiv. 3, 8, 10 . .	322	xxxvi. 6 . . .	263	35 . . .	162
xix. 23-26 . . .	194	xlvi. 8 . . .	269	ii. 3 . . .	105
xxxviii. 18 . . .	543	xliv. 23 . . .	307	iii. 1 . . .	117
Exod. viii. 15 . .	62	xliv. 24 . . .	63	v. 9 . . .	326
xi. 4 . . .	323	liii. 3 . . .	267	vi. 39 . . .	217
xx. 5 . . .	263	12 . . .	63	52 . . .	264
{xxix. 45 . . .	305	Jer. viii. 16 . . .	221	viii. 12 . . .	159
Lev. xvii. 7 . . .	323	xliv. 1 . . .	310	15 . . .	271
xxvi. 11, 12 . . .	305	Ezek. xxix. 6 . . .	263	x. 15 . . .	34
Deut. xxii. 12 . .	543	Dan. vii. 3 . . .	42	xiii. 21 . . .	32
xxxii. 10 . . .	328	18 . . .	269	xv. 29-32 . . .	153
1 Sam. i. 11 . . .	196	xii. 2 . . .	70	33-41 . . .	154
xvi. 14 . . .	323	Hosea x. 6 . . .	252	34 . . .	519
21 . . .	67	xii. 12 . . .	322	42-46 . . .	156
1 Kings xiv. 15 . .	263	Micah v. 2 . . .	271	47-xvi. 8 . . .	157
2 Kings xviii. 4 . .	528	Mal. ii. 17 . . .	191	Luke i. 35 . . .	313
xxiii. 8 . . .	322	Matt. i. 20 . . .	313	46 . . .	193
Job vi. 8 . . .	235	iv. 14-16 . . .	71	ii. 38 . . .	200
vii. 9 . . .	235	iv. 23 . . .	268	iii. 1 . . .	209
17 . . .	229	v. 17 . . .	4	15 . . .	12
ix. 30 . . .	229	vi. 26 . . .	245	iv. 17-21 . . .	34
xi. 16 . . .	231	ix. 6 . . .	513	19 . . .	207
xiii. 16 . . .	239	x. 1 . . .	269	21 . . .	4
xxiii. 8 . . .	242	xi. 7 . . .	259	31 . . .	103
xxxvii. 2 . . .	147	10 . . .	4	v. 18 . . .	105
xl. 2 . . .	190	12 . . .	34	vii. 24 . . .	259
Psa. xlv. 20 . . .	533	25-27 . . .	427	27 . . .	4
lxxiv. 14 . . .	529	xii. 28 . . .	29	viii. 27 . . .	117
lxxxix. 19-45 . .	407	41 . . .	261	30 . . .	326
Isa. ii. 2 . . .	304	xvi. 21 . . .	424	ix. 54 . . .	152
ix. 7 . . .	306	xxiv. 15 . . .	227	54-56 . . .	425
xi. 6 . . .	305	xxvi. 31-35 . . .	162	x. 9 . . .	34
8 . . .	306	41 . . .	170	17 . . .	60
xiii. 21, 22 . . .	528	xxvii. 46 . . .	169	21-22 . . .	427

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
Luke xi. 19 . . .	62	Acts iv. 13 . . .	9	Gal. ii. 11 . . .	344, 566
20 . . .	30	v. 37 . . .	206	iii. 1 . . .	352
31 . . .	261	vii. 23 . . .	219	19, 20 . . .	405
xiv. 5 . . .	444	xiii. 16-41 . . .	341	iv. 14 . . .	340
xviii. 31-33 . . .	5	46 . . .	350	Eph. i. 7 . . .	347
31-34 . . .	425	47 . . .	10	ii. 17 . . .	68
xxiii. 34 . . .	510	xv. 1-2 . . .	195	iv. 1, 2 . . .	429
43 . . .	270	10-11 . . .	429	4-6 . . .	472
xxiv. 45-7 . . .	6	28 . . .	564	vi. 12 . . .	71
John i. 45 . . .	4	xvi. 1 . . .	79	Phil. ii. 5 . . .	271
ii. 19 . . .	6	6-11 . . .	107	Col. i. 14 . . .	347
20 . . .	209	10-17 . . .	97	24 . . .	268
v. 1 . . .	216	xvii. 11 . . .	11	1 Thess. iv. 13 . . .	58
39 . . .	6	28 . . .	333	v. 3 . . .	221
vi. 15 . . .	163	xviii. 4 . . .	282	2 Thess. ii. 3 . . .	56, 227
viii. 39 . . .	65	xix. 14 . . .	64	13, 14 . . .	475
57 . . .	218	xx. 35 . . .	91	Titus i. 12 . . .	332
ix. 39 . . .	65	xxvii. 2 . . .	98	Heb. v. 7, 8 . . .	172
x. 11 . . .	66	Rom. v. 3-5 . . .	180	ix. 28 . . .	268
xi. 16 . . .	383	x. 14-21 . . .	58	1 Pet. i. 2 . . .	474
33 . . .	160	xi. 36 . . .	470	10-11 . . .	2
xii. 27, 28 . . .	172	1 Cor. iv. 13 . . .	268	iii. 19 . . .	59
xvi. 29 . . .	8	x. 14 . . .	568	2 Pet. i. 19 . . .	55
xxviii. 9 . . .	121	xii. 4 . . .	468	Rev. iv. 6 . . .	88
Acts ii. 30 . . .	9	xv. 49 . . .	270	vii. 1 . . .	89
iii. 17 . . .	16	2 Cor. vi. 11 . . .	284	xvii. 11 . . .	225
iv. 12 . . .	268	xi. 28 . . .	459		









GTU Library



3 2400 00276 6255